The American
Political Science Review

VOL. L DECEMBER, 1956 NO. 4

THE POLITICAL SCIENCE OF SCIENCE:

An Inquiry into the Possible Reconciliation of Mastery and Freedom*

HAROLD D. LASSWELL
Yale University

My intention is to consider political science as a discipline and as a profession in relation to the impact of the physical and biological sciences and of engineering upon the life of man. I propose to inquire into the possible reconciliation of man's mastery over Nature with freedom, the overriding goal of policy in our body politic.

In the interest of concreteness I shall have something to say about past and potential applications of science in three areas: armament, production, and evolution.

I. POLITICAL SCIENCE AND ARMAMENT

It is trite to acknowledge that for years we have lived in the afterglow of a mushroom cloud and in the midst of an arms race of unprecedented gravity. Here I shall support a proposition that may at first evoke some incredulous exclamations. The proposition is that our intellectual tools have been sufficiently sharp to enable political scientists to make a largely correct appraisal of the consequences of unconventional weapons for world politics.

We have correctly understood the strength of the factors that perpetuate a feeble international order even in the face of recent techno-scientific developments. The traditional tools at our disposal for the analysis of politics prepare us to regard a voluntary relinquishment of power as much less likely than efforts to perpetuate power. In a divided world it is not surprising to find that more elites expect to be in a better position by continuing the current system than by taking the risks involved in consenting to a new structure of power. But we have not dismissed as altogether hopeless the prospects of a more perfect union, achieved by measures short of general war. On the occasions when power is relinquished those who make the seeming sacrifice actually expect to be better off eventually in terms of power (and other values) than if they fail to pay the price.

---

* Presidential address delivered at the annual meeting of the Association in Washington, D. C., September 6, 1956.

For at times voluntary confederation, federation or integration does take place. Steps toward unity occur when elites perceive an external threat or obstacle to the preservation or fuller realization of commonly interpreted values. It occurs when elites perceive a common internal threat or obstacle. When atomic weapons appeared on the scene it required no great acumen to see that they were introduced under circumstances in which factors of division were heavily loaded against factors favoring a new structure of unity. Nuclear weapons were introduced unilaterally by one member of a wartime coalition. It is noteworthy that the innovating member did not feel sufficiently bound to allied and associated powers to share the new weapons with the coalition. When the enemy was defeated incentives to share were reduced. They were further reduced by the estrangement that promptly set in to separate the partners in a coalition that had been unable to achieve a high level of trust and cooperation even under the provocation of war.

It was easy to recognize that the active political elite of the largest potential rival of the United States had more inducements to procrastinate than to make the immediate sacrifices that would have been necessary for a global system of security. Moscow leaders were not faced by an ultimatum, but by an inspection proposal that in the beginning would undoubtedly have laid bare the full depth of Soviet weakness and disunity. The immediate burden of sacrifice would have fallen upon one side; what was missing was a means of equalizing the cost throughout the whole course of the proposed arrangement. Moscow had no grounds for believing that the decision makers of the outside world viewed them or their ideology or their technique with such benevolence that any visible vulnerability would remain unexploited. Certainly the annihilation of mankind seemed remote and hypothetical when compared with the deprivations likely to follow at once the formation of a new international structure.

It was no necessary part of the analysis to assume that leading Soviet figures loved war (after the manner of Ghenghis Khan and other nomadic "shepherds of men"). We understood that it would be political suicide for individual leaders on either side to propose full unilateral disarmament by their own government, or even to champion a ceiling or a method of arms reduction that would be regarded by colleagues or constituencies as unfavorable to continuing independence.

Nor was it part of the analysis to assume that individuals are fully conscious of the values that influence their judgment and that the thrust of unconscious factors is toward voluntary union. So far at least as the upper levels of an active elite are concerned it is implausible to suggest that continuing uncertainty will generate unconscious factors making for trust in the benevolence and good faith of alien leaders. The evidence seems to support the contrary view that protracted insecurity renders it easy to perceive the "Other" as malevolent and devious. Hence the tendency is toward the perpetuation of seeming autonomy rather than in the direction of constructing a more inclusive system of public order.

We knew that the decision process of a body politic is to be understood as a complex and relatively stable network of communication and collaboration. A system acts to sustain rather than to revolutionize its own structure. This harmonizes with the fact that more acts must be repetitive than innovative if a system is stable. More specifically, structural stability is favored by the entrapment of each individual in a limited segment of the whole. The official or unofficial role of a participant determines what is available to his focus of attention, and with whom he may communicate or collaborate. The perspectives of a participant are the result of previous experience in the position, and in the sequence of positions through which he has passed. The playing of any role modifies predispositions by rewarding an act with value indulgences or by imposing value deprivations. As a strategy of maintaining and improving their net value position, individuals continually make and unmake coalitions of an explicit or tacit character. Enough information has long been available to show a qualified observer that the private coalitions upon which members of the Soviet or U. S. elite depend for personal advancement are coalitions whose effect is to sustain rather than to supersede a divided world. Obviously the coalitions entered into by top officers in the Red Army, Navy and Air Forces are not made with Americans; and *vice versa*. Nor do the corresponding coalitions of top diplomats, civil officials, or party officials cut across the intervening zone.

also in law

There are, political scientists know, typical situations in which active elite elements have expected to benefit by means of a more perfect union. Ruling families have intermarried. Today this institutional presupposition is missing; the top men of the USSR or the USA are not dynastic heads. It is a frail reed indeed to rely upon the hope that a Moscow-Hollywood fusion of infatuated youngsters or calculating oldsters will banish the perils of nuclear fission or fusion. Some historic unifications have been the outcome of duels between appointed champions in the manner of David and Goliath. This institutional predisposition is also missing. No one seriously expects to stake the issue of unity upon two doughty pilots armed with jets, or two teams of missile men lobbing away at one another in the South Seas. We also take note of the fact that thus far we have been unable to rely upon the appearance of an external group capable of being perceived as a common threat. The U.F.O., the unidentified flying objects, have not as yet been shown to be intelligence eyes of another planet against whom we may conceivably combine.

I have been indicating how the tools of the profession provided us with categories, propositions and cases adequate to the task of assessing the probable result of the appearance of unconventional weapons. These tools were, in fact, so used. I do not assert that all members of the profession refrained from adding to the lamentations that arose as this or that circle of humanity awoke to the poignancy of the fact that the planet is moving toward apparent doom. Limited catharsis has often been obtained by railing at the stupidity or malevolence of world elites for failing to bring the current nightmare to a peaceful end. Some among us found a measure of private satisfaction in the discovery of fresh evidence of the depravity of man and turned for consolation to the trans-empirical doctrines provided by one or another of the theological and metaphysical traditions of mankind. We need not deprecate these personal solutions so long as it is clear that they are not the distinctive roles for which our profession has sought to equip its members.

To assert that political scientists had tools that enabled us to assess a major development correctly is not to say that we are complacent about our part in the story of nuclear weapons. There is always a gap between fundamental theory and the data required to see how theoretical models explain or fail to explain specific configurations. As private scholars political scientists did not always have access to official information; and even when playing an official role a political scientist was not always shown every significant report in the possession of the government. Such limitations go beyond our responsibility as a profession. We must however assume responsibility for any limitation of theory or procedure that prevented us from making full use of every opportunity open to us.

I have been implying that it is possible to interpret our traditional body of theory as giving full recognition to the contextual character of politics. The classical literature made plain that specialized institutions of community-wide action are part of, and interact with, all institutions of the community, all personalities, all institutional and personal patterns in the surrounding world, and with the physical and biological environment. Modern logical technique has made it more apparent than it was formerly that the intellectual task before us is not the discovery of a small number of new fundamental categories with which to designate the context of interaction. Rather, it is apparent that all comprehensive systems are formally equivalent (hence interchangeable) at corresponding levels of abstraction (and regardless of possible differences in the number of key terms employed at each level). The inference is that within a rich intellectual tradition the most significant task is to construct a continuing institutional activity by which central theory is related continuously to events as they unfold. The fundamental categories are retained as constant features of a frame of reference elaborated and employed to delineate the contours of observational fields. The relevant context is the world political process as a whole.

The limited degree of success achieved by the profession in perfecting or in encouraging the body politic to perfect such an institutional process had adverse consequences for our role in regard to nuclear weapons. Long before atomic weapons were introduced we were well aware of the importance of scientific knowledge for the technology of fighting. But we did not correctly anticipate the approximate timing of the impact of nuclear physics upon military technology. Although we were equipped to assess the political consequences of sudden and stupendous increases of fighting effectiveness we did not foresee that such an emergent was imminent. Since technical developments were not explicitly anticipated we did not clarify in advance the main policy alternatives open to decision makers in this country or elsewhere. We did not create a literature or a body of oral analysis that seriously anticipated these issues. As political scientists we should have anticipated fully both the bomb and the significant problems of policy that came with it.

I do not want to create the impression that all would have been well if we had been better political scientists, and that we must bear upon our puny shoulders the burden of culpability for the situation of the world today. We are not so grandiose as to magnify our role or our responsibility beyond all proportion. Yet I cannot refrain from acknowledging, as I look back, that we left the minds of our decision makers flagrantly unprepared to meet the crisis precipitated by the bomb. I have no desire to hold a kangaroo court on President Truman's momentous decision or upon his principal advisers; or to give credence to the insinuation that "results" had become necessary in the face of Congressional restiveness about the cost of research and development. In the light of hindsight (that should have been foresight) I want to underline the probability that the new weapon was introduced in a manner that contributed unnecessarily to world insecurity. Perhaps the critics are right who say that the bomb should have been demonstrated on an uninhabited island before the live drops were made on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. More important is the question of how formal and effective control might have been extended beyond the decision makers of a single power. At least some members of the winning coalition might wisely have been brought into a system that operated through a common agency of inspection and direction.

Plainly there were not enough political scientists trained in physics, or sufficiently aware of the implication of impending scientific developments, to do much forward thinking and planning. This points to a failure of professional recruitment and training, and calls in question the then-prevailing conception of the political scientist's role. As a profession we are concerned with aggregate processes. It is not our job to supply the working politician with what he knows already, namely a bag of electoral and other manipulative tricks. Our distinctive perspective is not that of a trickster although we must be familiar with the trickster's outlook and his repertory if we are to assess the causes and consequences of his way of doing business for the decision process as a whole in any context. Nor is our role limited to reiterating and celebrating the ideal aspirations of the body politic, and exhibiting how value goals can be derived from fundamental postulates and principles. It is not exhausted by reporting historical sequences to be found in the rise, diffusion and restriction of myth and technique; or even by the formalization and verification of descriptive models of a scientific character. Part of our role, as the venerable metaphor has it, is scanning the horizon of the unfolding future with a view to defining in advance the probable import of what is foreseeable for the navigators of the Ship of State. It is our responsibility to flagellate our minds toward creativity, toward bringing into the stream of emerging events conceptions of future strategy that, if adopted, will increase the probability that ideal aspirations will be more approximately realized.

An implication for our future relation to science and armament is that we need to develop more political scientists who have the competence to infer the weapon implications of science and technology. It then becomes possible to anticipate the implications for collective policy.

Even a moderate degree of cross-disciplinary training or continuing contact should have enabled us to prepare for the advent of nuclear fission (and fusion). The *Review of Modern Physics* carried an article by Louis Turner of Princeton University in January 1940 in which 133 papers were appraised. They began with Fermi's original report of 1934 and came down to the Hahn-Strassman-Meitner researches which made explicit the import of Fermi's original experiment. In passing it may be noted that the contributions of a dozen nations were catalogued in

Turner's review. Not more than half a dozen of the 133 papers were by American authors. Perhaps American political scientists may be partially absolved for lack of foresight under these circumstances. But the over-all record of the profession is not thereby improved, since I do not find that colleagues in other countries were any more in touch than we were. Incidentally, it is worth recording that a standard college textbook in physics included a chapter in which the implications of current research were clearly spelled out. Ernest Pollard of Yale University referred in 1940 to the possibility of nuclear reactors that might generate electrical power or detonate as immensely destructive bombs; or that might produce radioactive substances for research and industrial processes or for a new and frightful kind of chemical warfare. I note further that at the time of the Fermi-Dunning experiment at the Columbia University cyclotron in early 1939 some science writers (especially of the New York *Times*) were quite definite about what was at stake.

Today in assessing the years ahead we need solid bases of inference about the degree to which the cost of producing unconventional weapons can be cut. Is it probable that the elites of intermediate powers will soon have at their disposal instruments capable of doing enough damage to outside powers to exert a strong deterrent effect? If so, the destiny of intermediate powers will be less grim than it has appeared to be in the recent past. If the drift toward bipolarity is reduced, there will be less hypocrisy or desperation among the elites of intermediate powers in clanging the cymbals of national loyalty in public while they readjust private family, business and political affairs in the light of the contingency that one or the other pole will dominate the globe.

It is important to estimate the likelihood that the instruments of defense can regain ground they have lost in recent times. In what period of time (if at all) is it probable that manned or unmanned flying objects can be harmlessly destroyed before they are on target? Is there any prospect that new knowledge may be used in a few years to seal off great areas of the globe behind impenetrable "energy" shells? This would open the not altogether uninviting possibility that disagreeable sectors of the globe may be sealed over and left to their own devices much as small boys put dishpans over snake pits or gopher holes.

In many ways the most disturbing result of the laggard position of political scientists in comprehending science and technology is that we have displayed no intellectual initiative in furnishing guidance to those who are in command of modern knowledge and its instrumentalities. Alert businessmen have long been on the lookout for promising applications in the marketplace. The professional military man is now accustomed to take the initiative. The question for us as political scientists is whether we have given enough serious attention to the task of reducing the human cost of whatever violence we cannot dispense with.

As an exercise in this line of thought I invite you to use your imagination to ask what an instrument of coercion would look like that incapacitates without killing, mutilating or in any way imposing permanent incapacity. You and I will probably come up with the same answer: a gas or a drug or a beam that when applied will induce sleep or a similar state of suspension. We spent several billion dollars on A and H bombs; and it is commonly said, with some plausibility, that scientists and engineers give you what you pay for. Our suggestion (and I repeat an old proposal) is that we go down the alphabet to the P bomb, the "paralysis bomb." The technical difficulties in the way of paralyzing a city or a region are very great, given current means of delivering a concentrated gas. Possibly the instrument can be a "P beam," a paralyzing beam of sound or of some other kind capable of accomplishing the purpose.

Without being in the least committed to the specific devices referred to, I nevertheless assert that in the future we need not remain as passive as we have been in approaching the problem of harmonizing considerations of humanity with the use of whatever coercion cannot be avoided.

So far as ultra-weapons are concerned it is apparent that the polar powers have reached an impasse. If they keep on they will have the capability of destroying one another several times over. Once would seem to be enough. (Diverting resources to blasting a grave assumes that it is not a common one.) The polar powers have a common affirmative interest in preventing the rise of an outlying gangster or maniac who might take advantage of the declining cost of nuclear weapons to hold up or gravely damage them both. It may be that workable policy proposals will emerge from concentrated study. For instance, in return for universal inspection of new installations the polar powers might be willing to contribute facilities and scientists to UN laboratories situated at intermediate points and devoted to research and development of new and fundamental scientific ideas. By providing for the possible exploitation of the results under collective auspices it may be possible to expedite the development of the UN into a genuine "third factor" that concurrently expresses an inclusive interest. Senator Anderson of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has already declared in favor of any policy that holds promise of joint activities that "obsolesce" old weapons around which vested and sentimental interests are crystallized.)

N.P.

Since we are aware of the unforeseeable timing of the many factors that may affect a resort to arms it is evident that rational policies on behalf of peaceful cooperation do not rely upon a single avenue of approach. Wise strategy appeals to as many potential pockets of motivation as possible by making continual use of tactical ingenuity in applying every instrument of policy (diplomatic, military, economic, ideological).

It is generally believed that peaceful cooperation can be most readily encouraged in the field of economic growth. And there are grounds for predicting that developments that impend in the technology of production will rival the leaps that have recently occurred in weapon technology. This brings me to the consideration of our relationship as political scientists to these potentialities. Although the devices that contribute to production may also be employed for destructive purposes, my present concern is with the affirmative uses of science.

II. POLITICAL SCIENCE AND PRODUCTION

Impending is control of weather and climate. As our knowledge of the upper atmosphere increases it will be obvious that the seeding of local cloud formations is a relatively trivial precursor of hemispheric global control. Impending is the solution of the problem of obtaining pure water at low cost from the sea for irrigation purposes. Taken in conjunction with newly available energy sources it is not too early to anticipate the reclamation of the wastelands of the earth—the deserts, the polar ice caps, the tropical rain forests, the mountains (levelled to productive plateaus). As J. G. Harrar has told us, the total solar energy that reaches the earth every 48 hours is approximately equal to all the known reserves of coal, petroleum and wood. Clearly the conversion of relatively minute amounts to usable form would meet the energy needs of future generations. Already enough progress has been made to indicate that in the immediate future many local power needs can be supplied more economically by solar energy than by nuclear installations.

As political scientists we are conscious of the implications if great resource changes are introduced into a divided world. Imagine that the arid areas inside the Soviet zone are populated with the density of the fertile districts. Suppose further that the non-Soviet world does away with the arid lands of the United States, Mexico and South America, the Sahara, and the Middle East. If these regions become as populous as the more habitable parts of the countries where they are located the population of the non-Soviet world will be increased relatively more than the Soviet area.

Think next of the tropical forests. If the tropical rain forests of Central and Northern South America, of Mid-Africa, of India and of Southeastern Asia are made fit for human life to the same degree as the more temperate regions near them the relative population of the non-Soviet world will appreciably increase.

If mountainous areas are transformed into plateaus, and the plateaus are populated to the density of neighboring areas, the population of the non-Soviet world will also sustain a relative rise.

We know that the political consequences of changes in population and energy production depend upon the impact of these developments upon the "threat value" or the "asset value" of the members of the world community to one another. We expect that the flow of capital and know-how required to modernize production tends to conform the facts of economic growth to the configurations that predominate in the arena of world politics. One alternative of policy is to mitigate or modify this tendency to pour the concrete of capital investment into the mould of a current power alignment. To what extent can this result be achieved by instituting multilateral control of great programs of reclamation in selected districts? Can the Sahara, for instance, be jointly developed? Since the ruling circles of a split world pursue different objectives in terms of social structure and ideology it is only feasible to think of even restricted programs of multilateral cooperation within the frame of an agreement in which are prescribed the permissible proportions between governmentalized and non-governmentalized operation to be preserved at successive stages of the project. Further, it will be essential to determine whether the program is intended to consolidate an existing national unity or to lay the foundation for a new nation (one drawn, for example, from widely varying ethnic sources; or from a single principal source of people and culture).

The factor of geographical dispersion has an important bearing upon our expectations. The sources of solar and atomic energy are more capable of being widely distributed than the sources exploited by a technology of fossil fuels like petroleum and coal. It is axiomatic that a decentralized pattern of access to energy provides a favorable resource base for a decentralized outlook, and that the perspectives comprising such an outlook sustain a decentralized network of policy formation and execution. If a reversal is to occur in the trend toward bipolarizing the world, and a pattern resembling the Great Power System of the last century is to revive, two conditions at least must be fulfilled: a network of strong, coordinate centers of energy production; and cheaper costs of producing the newer weapons.

I have been talking of the resources found in the wastelands or neglected opportunities on the surface of the continental blocs. We must take the fact into account that new resources are in prospect whether we look beneath or above the land surface of the earth. To begin with the seas: we shall learn to mine the waters for minerals and to farm the oceans for foodstuffs on a scale hitherto unthinkable. In regard to resources above the surface: we are close to the first experimental expeditions to the moon; and, presently the planets. In this setting the traditional questions that center around the control of air space take on new significance.

As specialists in public law it is not difficult for us to anticipate the form in which conflicting claims to these new resources are likely to be phrased. In connection with the seas those who push particular claims to the exclusive exploitation of a given region will talk in terms of "the territorial sea," "contiguous zones," "jurisdiction" and the "continental shelf." Nation states whose officials push particular claims to share in exploiting the resources of an area will invoke the "freedom of the seas" and other internationalizing concepts. The probing of the upper atmosphere, satellite launching, space platforms and the like will pose the problem of how to adjust claims to exclusive control of "air space" against claims to share control. As expeditions to the moon or the planets become more imminent the question of "who owns what" or "who controls what" will bring into the debate the authoritative language traditionally employed in connection with the acquisition of territory ("exploration," "occupation," "conquest" and other concepts emphasizing priority in time and effectiveness of control).

As clarifiers of the goals and alternatives implicit in a decision process and as advisers of the participants we have an opportunity to reduce the amount of unnecessary friction by establishing a frame of reference in advance of the facts. When factual details appear they will of course exhibit some novel elements; common goals and principles will not. The members of the world community have a long history of accommodating "exclusive" claims and "sharing" claims with one another (as new resources provide new base values for the participants in the world arena).

It is, of course, essential that in taking advantage of this opportunity we deal with the entire context of value goals and principles as they relate to potential facts. I have referred to sets of doctrines that in all probability will be invoked when claims are made. The chief function of these formulations is to guide the attention of decision makers to the context in which pertinent activities occur. Formulas assist in recognizing and evaluating the consequences for international public order of accepting the exclusive or the sharing claim in particular cases or categories of cases.

When we examine past trends in world history it is not difficult to recognize that shifts have occurred in the relative emphasis laid upon exclusive or sharing claims. Grotius was speaking for the Netherlands and for other challengers of the claims of Spain, Portugal and England to monopolize great stretches of the seas. Sweeping readjustments were made in doctrine and in its applications relating to the seas. At first they were mainly in the direction of consolidating an international order in which sharing claims were widely accepted ("freedom of the seas"). In recent decades the trend has been the other way. As my colleague Myres S. McDougal has shown in some detail, claims to the exclusive enjoyment of resources have been accepted as "reasonable" in the light of facts that have appeared in the course of applying science and technology. A recent tabulation shows that no more than thirteen states accept the ancient three-mile rule for the territorial sea. Forty-five states repudiate it in varying degree, claiming wider limits. Contiguous zones of many kinds have been accepted for the administration of customs, the security of neutral states against belligerent activities, fishing conservation, appropriation of the resources of the sea-bed and of the continental shelf.

When we think configuratively about the problems raised in reference to the new resources it is clear that instead of relying on blanket principles (like "freedom of the seas" or "freedom of the air") the most fruitful policy alternatives are likely to emerge when we anticipate the appearance of characteristic factual contexts, and consider how the values chiefly at stake in them can be maximized. Hence we would not expect to apply the same prescription (1) to the sharing of air space for weather observation (where equipment is used that is expressly designed for the purpose and perhaps registered, and when the information obtained is made public) and (2) to the sharing of air space for projects of weather or climate control that may be deleterious to local values.

The contextual (or, synonymously, the configurative) approach is a challenge to imagine the full range of possible means of anticipating and resolving difficulties. On the most uncertain matters it is appropriate to call attention to the need of exploring the possibilities of agreement in advance of conflict. The inference is that no time should be lost, for instance, in putting into the hands of the UN the facilities for research, development and operation of satellites, "space platforms" and travel beyond the limits of the earth's atmospheric and gravitational fields. Doubtless the USA and the USSR will continue to compete with independent programs. Since the polar powers have a stake in moderating the conflict in which they are engaged in the hope of eventual harmony through agreement, not catastrophe, a practical method would appear to be to strengthen the "third factor," especially when both powers are also included within it.

The rapid introduction of new resources under present conditions calls for some degree of community and regional planning; and planning poses thorny questions about the structure and ideology of society. To an increasing extent questions of this kind need to be answered directly rather than by default. It must be conceded that American political scientists are not especially well equipped to participate in the planning function on the scale required. Although we are accustomed to corroborate the classical authorities and the Founding Fathers in praise of the middle classes as contributory to popular institutions of government, we have not as a rule dealt with these traditional doctrines in significant ways. For instance, we have not explored the principles of proportion that are most likely to consolidate or to sustain at various stages of industrial growth the perspectives and operational technique of popular government. Shall we, for example, rely upon a 30-40-50 rule to guide public policy in regard to the permissible degree of market control permitted to private interests? (For example: When one interest has 30% control of output, shall it be subject to special regulations designed to nullify the side-effects of power that go along with economic control? When one interest rises to 40% shall we put governmentally appointed trustees on the Board of Directors? At 50% shall government trustees predominate?)

Whatever the workable rules of proportion may be in representative contexts it is evident that we need to guide our studies of trend correlation and of comparative cases in order to improve the available bases of inference in such matters.

The same approach—the search for rules of proportion—applies to every institutional and personality pattern in a body politic. What are the optimum proportions of community resources to devote to elementary, intermediate, advanced and ultra-advanced education? To research and development in science and technology? To positive and negative sanctions for correctional and other purposes?

One way to jar "cakes of custom" out of the mind is to draft specifications for the first Mayflower expedition to establish continuing occupation outside the earth. (Possibly it could be "Noah's Jet"?) What proportion of men, women and children of which culture or combination of earth cultures shall we select? What ideological traditions, secular and sacred? What class backgrounds (elite, mid-elite, mass)? What individual and group interests? What personality structures?

By asking questions of this kind we are in a position to assess our present stock of knowledge concerning the interdependence of institutions specialized to power, and all other institutions in the social process of any community, together with the forms of personality involved. These, of course, are the recurring issues of political science and historical interpretation as well as policy.

III. POLITICAL SCIENCE AND EVOLUTION

I have been referring to a few implications of science and technology for weapons and production, and sketching some political ramifications. As political scientists we are perhaps even less well prepared to anticipate developments in genetics, experimental embryology and related disciplines. Taken together these fields signify that, as Julian Huxley has often put it, man is on the threshold of taking evolution into his own hands. By influencing the genes that constitute the key units in man's biological inheritance we affect the entire potential of future generations.

Important as recent innovations are in radioactivity I do not want to give more than passing notice to the dangers that they embody. The only feasible means of coping with these factors is by policies that avert war and preparation for war, and install proper precautions in the handling of high energy radiation for other purposes.

Quite recently the dangers that arise from radioactivity have been authoritatively brought to public notice: all high energy radiation that reaches the gonads stimulates gene mutations; more than 99 per cent of all mutations are dangerous; genes can only be eliminated by the death of the gene carrier or by his incapacity to reproduce. Nearly two years ago H. J. Müller told us that the bomb tests since the war had already exposed the inhabitants of the earth to radioactivity comparable with that of the inhabitants of Hiroshima and Nagasaki after the original explosions. He estimated that about 80,000 harmful mutations are involved and that "it will mean, in the end, several times this number of hampered lives."

It has been pointed out that perhaps the most satisfactory index of genetic damage is the sum of tangible defects existing among living individuals. We are speaking of such stigmata as "mental defects, epilepsy, congenital malformations, neuromuscular defects, hematological and endocrine defects, defects in vision or hearing, cutaneous and skeletal defects, or defects in the gastrointestinal or genitourinary tracts." We are informed that about 2 per cent of the live births in the United States have defects that are of "simple genetic origin and appear prior to sexual maturity." If mankind were subjected to a "double dosing" of radiation the present level of genetic defects would rise, and would eventually be doubled.

Regulatory measures are obviously needed against wars and weapon tests; and they are essential to the disposition of nuclear waste from industrial plants. (It has been remarked that a nuclear power plant is to be viewed as a large scale production of both highly poisonous gas and explosives under a single roof.)

The principal questions to which I desire to call attention pose issues of a relatively new and different order. Some of these questions have already come up in controversies over artificial insemination. They have embarrassed the champions of the orthodox prescriptions that prevail in several fields (theology, ethics, jurisprudence). Shall we call a child legitimate whose biological father is not identical with the sociological father? Even with the consent of the latter? With spermatozoa from a known or unknown source? (A possible international question is whether a nation state like the United States can claim the child as a citizen if the spermatozoa employed originated with an American mail order house and was sent by air mail for use abroad.)

Poignant as these issues are in specific cases they do not confront us with the consequences for public order that are to be anticipated if the progress of biology separates insemination and child bearing from genital contact. The assumption is often made that the continuation of sexual rectitude and even civic order depends upon charging every genital contact with the blessings and perils of procreation. The impending improvement of oral contraceptives, joined with other recent advances, are factors that already suggest the wisdom of other norms and sanctions of public order.

Other developments are threatening current ratios of the influence and power of the sexes. Given the millions and millions of spermatozoa produced by one male and the technique of canning by refrigeration, any very large number of males becomes relatively redundant for purposes of procreation. Must the male rest his future upon other values such as the strictly aesthetic appeal of the male contour? Before the female of the species becomes too complacent in this context it may be worth recalling the significance of some current experiments for the removal of the primordial female function from the body and into other receptacles. (Women, too, may have to rely upon their charm, a role for which their experience has provided extensive preparation.)

Apparently we are closer than most of us like to think to the production of species that occupy an intermediate position between man and the lower animals (or even plants). It is sometimes said, even in august quarters, that "one has not yet succeeded in making a species from another species." Theodosius Dobzhansky notes, however, that "the feat of obtaining a new species was accomplished more than a quarter of a century ago." In recent decades a fair number of new species have been brought into being. It is also true that some species that exist in nature have been recreated experimentally. A garrison police regime fully cognizant of science and technology can, in all probability, eventually aspire to biologize the class and caste system by selective breeding and training. Such beings can, in effect, be sown and harvested for specialized garrison police services or for other chosen operations.

Great strides have been taken in brain design. Experimental models of robots have been built who solve problems of a rather complex order in a given environment. Some of these machines look after themselves to a degree, obtaining and using the raw materials required for energy and repairs. Already it is claimed that the function of reproducing its kind, and of interacting with others, can be in-built.

The question then rises: Given our concern for human dignity when do we wisely extend all or part of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to these forms? When do we accept the humanoids—the species intermediate between lower species and man, and which may resemble us in physique as well as in the possession of an approximately equivalent central nervous and cortical system—as at least partial participants in the body politic? And at what point do we accept the incorporation of relatively self-perpetuating and mutually influencing "super-machines" or "ex-robots" as beings entitled to the policies expressed in the Universal Declaration?

It is obvious that we are not too well equipped by cultural tradition to cope with these problems. A trait of our civilization is the intense sentimentalization of superficial differences in the visible format of the groupings to be found even within the human species. Recall the theologians, ethicists and jurists who have devoted themselves to the elaboration of symbols to show that the white race alone is genuinely human and hence solely entitled to the dignity of freedom. Recall, too, the counter-assertions, nourished in the soil of humiliation, that have arisen among ethnic groups that seek to overcome their contempt for themselves by dragging down the pretensions of the white imperialist.

Let us recognize that the traditions of certain non-Western civilizations are in some ways better adapted to the problem than the Graeco-Roman and Judeo-Christian perspectives. They possess a relatively broad basis for identifying the primary ego of the individual with a self that includes more than strictly human species in the congregation of living forms. A world view that includes the possibility of reincarnation in lower animal shapes, for example, may prepare its devotees to empathize more readily with other than strictly human species and varieties. Even they, however, may have their troubles with a mobile power plant in nearly human form.

The most disturbing question, perhaps, arises when we reflect upon the possibility that super-gifted men, or even new species possessing superior talent, will emerge as a result of research and development by geneticists, embryologists or machine makers. In principle, it is not too difficult to imagine a superior form. For instance, our sensory equipment does not enable us to take note of dangerous radiation levels in the environment. We have no inborn chattering of a Geiger counter.

I spoke before of taking the intellectual initiative for the use of science and technology for the fuller realization of our value goals. It is plain that if we bring certain kinds of living forms into the world we may be introducing a biological elite capable of treating us in the manner in which imperial powers have so often treated the weak. A question is whether the cultivation of superior qualities ought to be limited to intellectual capability. The answer, I feel confident you will agree, is in the negative. We need to be sufficiently vigilant to prevent the turning loose on the world of a hyper-intelligent species driven by an instinctual system especially inclined toward predation. The blood-stained story of our own species is only too familiar (the stories about succulent missionaries whose bodies were more readily incorporated than their messages are not wholly without foundation). Can we improve the prospects of developing a form of intelligent life copied not after our own image, but after the image of our nobler aspirations?

It is not to be overlooked that the problem of human capability can become acute if in the years ahead we escape from our present habitat on the earth, or are visited by other forms of intelligent life. There are, after all, untold millions of environments resembling our solar system, and it would be more remarkable to find that but one planet is inhabited by a complex living form than to encounter parallel developments. It would of course be embarrassing, at least, to discover that we are the savages or that we are put together on a markedly inferior biological plan.

IV. OUR FUTURE PROGRAM

The fact is that many of the problems to which I have been referring will be upon us long before we can make great changes in the ideological outlook or the socio-political patterns of life in this country or elsewhere. The same point applies to ourselves in our role as individuals and as members of the political science profession. Considering our present predispositions how can we improve the likelihood of contributing to the decision process at every level, from the neighborhood to the world as a whole?

It is abundantly clear that the impact of science and technology does not occur in a social vacuum, but in a context of human identifications, demands and expectations. I make the modest proposal that it is appropriate for political scientists, in company with other scientists and scholars dealing with human affairs, to improve our procedures of continuous deliberation upon the potential impacts of science and technology upon human affairs. No doubt the American Political Science Association and other professional societies constitute an appropriate network for the purpose. We can sustain continuing conferences devoted to the examination of emerging developments. As fellow professionals we have special responsibility for giving thought to the aggregate effects of any specific innovation.

Our first professional contribution, it appears, is to project a comprehensive image of the future for the purpose of indicating how our overriding goal values are likely to be affected if current policies continue.

A closely related contribution consists in clarifying the fundamental goal values of the body politic. We are accustomed to confront political ideologies with new factual contingencies and to suggest appropriate specific interpretations. We also confront political doctrines with rival doctrines, and with comprehensive theological and metaphysical systems. I have called attention to the point that the basic value systems of European civilization, in particular, are likely to be exposed to sweeping challenge as biology and engineering narrow the obvious differences between man and neighboring species, and between man and centrally operating machines. The crisis will be peculiarly sharp if we create or discover forms of life superior to man in intellect or instinctual predispositions. Our traditions have not been life-centered, but man-centered. We possess various paranoid-like traditions of being "chosen." Clearly a difficult task of modifying these egocentric perspectives lies ahead.

The third task is historical and scientific. It is historical in the sense that by mobilizing knowledge about the past we are enabled to recognize the appearance of new patterns and the diffusion or restriction of the old. It is scientific in the sense that we summarize the past in order to confirm (or disconfirm) propositions about the interplay of predisposition and environment. If we are to serve the aims of historic recognition and of scientific analysis, one of our professional responsibilities is to expedite the development of more perfect institutions specialized to continual self-observation on a global scale. Self-observation requires guidance by a system of theoretical models of the political process in which a continuing gradation is maintained between the most inclusive model and submodels adjusted to more limited contexts in time and space. Continual self-observation renders it necessary at each step through time to reevaluate the appropriateness of the operational indices for the variables and concepts employed at the most recent step. In this way all the concepts that figure in systematic, descriptive political science can be kept chronically pertinent to the ordering of political events as the future unfolds.

The fourth task is inventive and evaluative. It consists in originating policy alternatives by means of which goal values can be maximized. In estimating the likely occurrence of an event (or event category), it is essential to take into account the historical trends and the scientifically ascertained predispositions in the world arena or any pertinent part thereof.

The relationship of American political science to these tasks is in many ways unique. The typical department is a microcosm of the macrocosm of university faculties of the social sciences and humanities, and the school of law. It is no secret that a syndicate of philosophers, historians, behavioral scientists and public lawyers is capable of producing some degree of tension among themselves, especially when budgets are at stake. This has led to the suggestion that every component skill should be sent back where it came from—to the departments of philosophy, history, sociology and psychology, for example, and to the law school. In this way political science could be given back to the Indians. The catch is that we are not agreed who the Indians may be.

The present situation does make it possible for political scientists to take the lead in integrating rather than dividing our intellectual community. Compared with an entire university, which has become a noncommunicating aggregate of experts, each department of political science can be a true center of integration where normative and descriptive frames of reference are simultaneously and continuously applied to the consideration of the policy issues confronting the body politic as a whole over the near, middle and distant ranges of time.

The profession is advantageously situated therefore to take the lead in a configurative approach to the decision process in society. Where it plays this part, political science is the policy science, *par excellence*. If the implications of science and technology are to be correctly appraised, it will be essential to recruit some trained personnel from such fields into political science, to improve the science-content of professional education, and to provide for continuing cooperation among the professions involved.

It is quite unnecessary for any one individual to emulate the universal ambitions of renaissance man. But if we are to take the lead in performing the configurative or matrix function it is quite essential for the profession as a whole to achieve the division of labor, the understanding and the insight capable of realizing as fully as possible the dream of relevant universality. Each of us can at least widen the boundaries of the self and open the way to identify with living forms that differ from traditional images. We can step toward the possible reconciliation of a growing mastery over Nature with the dignity of freedom for all that lives. In the congregation of living forms human life may come to play a yet more distinguished role in generations to come, a role that transcends even the vision of the commonwealth of man championed by the distinguished political scientist and statesman, the centennial of whose birth we take pride in according special commemoration this year.

THE ORIGINS OF THE PRESENT JAPANESE CONSTITUTION

ROBERT E. WARD
University of Michigan

Throughout the years when the Meiji Constitution served for most purposes as Japan's basic law (1890–1947), it was always a matter of considerable value to the nation's constitutional scholars to have readily available an authoritative statement of the intent of the framers of that document. This was Itō Hirobumi's *Kempō Gige* (Commentaries on the Constitution).[1] It played a role somewhat analogous to that of Madison's journals in our own annals of constitutional, legal and historical scholarship, but was even more definitive. It is interesting therefore to speculate just where present or future Japanese scholars might find a similar source for their present constitution. The facts presently available would indicate the necessity of a pilgrimage to New York's Waldorf Tower. There or in its immediate environs are to be found the most notable of the "founding fathers" of the present Japanese Constitution.

I

That one should have to seek on foreign shores for the author of the fundamental law of a great modern state is in itself a phenomenon unique in recent history. Even stranger perhaps is the fact that some nine years after its promulgation and four years after the end of the military occupation which made it possible in the first place, this constitution remains formally intact and unamended. If there were a sure prospect that it would remain so, perhaps the entire issue might better be left to the attention of future historians. But it has become increasingly clear during the last two years that the so-called "conservative" groups which control contemporary Japanese politics are determined to amend the present constitution in a number of important respects, if not indeed ultimately to rewrite it completely.[2]

This emerging campaign is now beginning to utilize the issue of the constitution's alien authorship. It is doubtful that the time is yet ripe for a full-blown national publicity campaign focused upon this point, for the revisionist movement is still at a fairly early stage of development.[3] The scene is being carefully prepared, however, and it now seems distinctly probable that when the Government chooses to present formally its bills of constitutional revision, the twin facts that the document was American and may readily be portrayed as having been imposed upon a reluctant Japanese Government as a result of none-too-gentle Occupation suasion will constitute an important part of its case.

---

[1] Tōkyō, Maruzen, 1889. Prince Itō had been in charge of the small group which actually drafted the Meiji Constitution.

[2] I have given a detailed account of these developments in "The Constitution and Current Japanese Politics," *Far Eastern Survey*, Vol. 25, pp. 49–58 (April 1956).

[3] In fact, the Socialists and their allies gained a sufficient number of seats in the Upper House election of July 8, 1956 to prevent the passage of any bill of constitutional revision for at least the next three years.

This is to say that a major policy and program of the late Allied Occupation of Japan is about to be reviewed on terms which cannot help but be of serious concern to the United States. The fact that the Occupation was in a technical sense an Allied operation will divert no criticism from this country. No one in Japan or abroad considers it as anything but what for all practical purposes it most patently was—a strictly American endeavor. As a consequence it is the United States which will be arraigned informally but effectively before Japanese public opinion. The actions of our officially responsible agents during 1945–46 are already being challenged in a number of important respects. Particularly where the constitution is concerned, an increasing number of questions are being asked in Japan under increasingly public circumstances. By what legally recognized authority was constitutional revision required of Japan? If such an authority existed, was its implementation properly the prerogative of the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) or of the Far Eastern Commission (FEC)? Who wrote the constitution in the first instance? What was their authority to do so, and what were their qualifications? What types and degrees of pressure were used to induce the Japanese Government to accept constitutional revision, and how justifiable were the pressures? To what extent did the actions of the Occupation authorities in Japan represent the official policy of the United States?

Oddly enough, these are questions which have not as yet been seriously raised in this country. A scattering of individuals and at least two official reports have cast considerable light upon some or all of them, but outside of scholarly circles scant attention has been paid.[4] Public opinion in this country seems to believe that, whatever our failures or shortcomings elsewhere, in Japan our Occupation on the whole did a remarkably effective job. In many important respects this is true, but the successes should not obscure the other side of the record, especially since our mistakes have a nasty habit of returning years later to plague both the domestic and the international scene. Japan's present fundamental law—often termed the "MacArthur" or the "Whitney Constitution" after its two most eminent progenitors—is a case in point. The Japanese and, incidentally, the world public will hear a good deal about this subject in the near future, and it behooves us in particular, as a principal party, to know the facts of the matter. Due to an understandable official reticence, these are not yet all available but, insofar as the story can now be pieced together, they seem to diverge at important points from the several versions so far made public.

---

[4] See, for example, Mark Gayn, *Japan Diary* (New York, 1948); SCAP, Government Section, *Political Reorientation of Japan* (Washington, 1950), 2 vols.; Theodore H. McNelly, *Domestic and International Influences on Constitutional Revision in Japan, 1945–1946* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation at Columbia University, 1952); U. S. Department of State, *The Far Eastern Commission* (Department of State Publication 5138; Washington, 1953); Harry Emerson Wildes, *Typhoon in Tokyo* (New York, 1954); Harold S. Quigley and John E. Turner, *The New Japan, Government and Politics* (Minneapolis, 1956); and a work by the former chief of the Government Section, Courtney Whitney; *MacArthur His Rendezvous with History* (New York, 1956). The Royal Institute of International Affairs has published a recent and authoritative contribution to this list by Hugh Borton in F. C. Jones, Hugh Borton and B. R. Pearn, *The Far East, 1942–1946* (London and New York 1955).

II

The story properly begins with a consideration of the terms upon which Japan surrendered to the Allied Powers. The subsequent legal rights of the Occupation to control and to impose "reforms"—including constitutional changes—upon Japan depend ultimately upon the nature and extent of the commitments which Japan and the victorious Powers respectively assumed at the time of surrender. These are set forth in the Potsdam Proclamation of July 26, 1945, in the several notes subsequently exchanged between Japan and the Allied Powers, and in the formal Instrument of Surrender signed at Tōkyō Bay on September 2, 1945. It is the ambiguity of these documents which gives rise to the principal legal issue here involved. This might perhaps be summarized in the question: to what extent is an unconditional surrender really unconditional?

Section 13 of the so-called Potsdam Proclamation states clearly the doctrine of unconditional surrender in the following terms: "We call upon the government of Japan to proclaim now the unconditional surrender of all Japanese armed forces, and to provide proper and adequate assurances of their good faith in such action. The alternative for Japan is prompt and utter destruction." Despite this forthright demand for "unconditional" surrender, much of the remainder of the Proclamation is devoted to a statement of the Allied Powers' intentions *vis-à-vis* a defeated Japanese Empire. This constitutes in effect a series of "conditions" whereby the Allies undertake certain obligations to the Japanese, e.g. to preserve Japanese sovereignty over the home islands, to allow Japan's disarmed troops to return home, to permit Japan to maintain certain industries and to withdraw the Allied occupying forces at a specified future occasion. The fact that the United States government has chosen officially to adopt the view that these stipulations do not constitute conditions possessed of any binding contractual force does not of itself preclude or invalidate variant interpretations by other interested parties.[5]

The particular aspect of these negotiations of present interest, however, concerns the degree to which they legitimize the Occupation's later activities in the field of constitutional reform. Here again the documents were ambiguously enough drawn so that variant and contradictory interpretations emerge. On the one hand, Sections 6 and 10 of the Potsdam Declaration demand that: "There must be eliminated for all time the authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest . . . "; and that: "The Japanese Government shall remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights shall be established." On the other hand; according to Section 12, "The occupying forces of the Allies shall be withdrawn from Japan as soon as these objectives have been accomplished *and there has been established in accordance with the freely expressed will of the Japanese people a peacefully inclined and responsible government.*"[6] A major contradiction lurks in these high-sounding phrases. If the first group is emphasized, it is quite possible to argue with some cogence and persuasiveness, as General Whitney has actually done,[7] that the removal of "all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people" is impossible without substantial constitutional and governmental reforms and that these are, consequently, authorized by the Potsdam terms. But if, on the other hand, one looks primarily to the "freely expressed will of the Japanese people" proviso, one can argue that, although in terms it only purports to set a precondition to the withdrawal of forces, it requires that in the last analysis the Japanese people must freely determine what specific type of "peacefully inclined and responsible government" they prefer. Any abridgment of this right then presumably becomes a breach of the obligations undertaken, morally at least, by the Allied Powers at Potsdam.

---

[5] See *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 2, pp. 413–15; and Jones, Borton and Pearn, *op. cit.*, pp. 506–07, for the texts of these official exchanges.

An examination of the basic documents will indicate that an embarrassing prominence has been accorded by the Allies, and in particular by the Government of the United States, to this "freely expressed will of the Japanese people" proviso. In addition to its original occurrence in the Potsdam Proclamation, the official Allied reply of August 11, 1945 to Japan's qualified acceptance of the Potsdam terms reiterated and made more specific the commitment of Paragraph 12: "The ultimate form of government of Japan shall, in accordance with the Potsdam Declaration, be established by the freely expressed will of the Japanese people." This point was underlined again in the presidential directive of September 6, 1945, entitled "United States Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan":[8]

> The ultimate objectives of the United States in regard to Japan, to which policies in the initial period must conform, are: . . .
>
> (b) To bring about the eventual establishment of a peaceful and responsible Government which will respect the rights of other states and will support the objectives of the United States as reflected in the ideals and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. *The United States desires that this government should conform as closely as may be to principles of democratic self-government but it is not the responsibility of the Allied Powers to impose upon Japan any form of government not supported by the freely expressed will of the people.*

On November 3, 1945, the language of the italicized portion of this statement was reiterated almost verbatim in the Joint Chiefs of Staff "Basic Initial Post-Surrender Directive to SCAP (The Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers) for the Occupation and Control of Japan." Thus, although the case is not conclusive, it can certainly be argued from the published documents that the Allied Powers, the United States as the chief occupying power, and the Supreme

---

[6] Italics added.

[7] *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 2, pp. 622–23.

[8] *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. 423. Italics added.

Commander as their immediate agent were officially and publicly committed to the policy of favoring and supporting, *but not imposing*, a democratic form of government upon Japan. It was repeatedly asserted at the outset that ultimately "the freely expressed will of the Japanese people," not the desire of the United States or SCAP, was to prevail in this sphere.

Nevertheless, it was made apparent to the Japanese authorities very early in the Occupation that the Supreme Commander felt that "no political reform that did not encompass revision of the Meiji Constitution would be worth serious considerstion."[9] Without that, he apparently felt that any reforms which might be achieved would be fatally vulnerable to the whims of future cabinets and Diets, once the protection afforded by the Occupation's authority was withdrawn. In September, 1945, General MacArthur informed the then premier, Prince Higashikuni, that he regarded constitutional revision as a matter of prime importance. In October the issue figured prominently in interviews between General MacArthur, Prince Konoe and the new premier, Shidehara Kijurō. Prince Konoe was informed in some detail of those constitutional dispositions which SCAP felt should be changed.[10]

Stimulated in this manner, the Japanese themselves began working on constitutional revision. In fact, due to a curious "misapprehension" on the part of Prince Konoe which has never been satisfactorily explained, they set up two separate and competing agencies in this field. The first, located technically within the Imperial Household, was headed by Prince Konoe assisted by Professor Sasaki Sōichi. This was established on October 11, 1945, and pretty much collapsed as a serious political effort with the issuance of an anonymous statement by Allied Headquarters on November 1, 1945 denying Konoe's repeated public statements that his efforts in this field had been suggested and were sponsored by General MacArthur himself. Despite this rebuff, Konoe is said to have presented an Outline of Constitutional Revisions to the Emperor on November 22, 1945, which was supplemented by a more detailed statement by his colleague Professor Sasaki on November 24.[11]

The second and but slightly more durable agency, established by the Japanese Government on October 24, 1945, was a cabinet Committee for the Investigation of Constitutional Problems, under the chairmanship of a former Tōkyō University law professor and then minister-without-portfolio, Matsumoto Jōji. This included a number of outstanding Japanese legal experts and held some seven general and fifteen research meetings between October 27, 1945 and its dissolution on February 2, 1946. We have no information, from Mr. Satō's account or any other published source, about what went on in the inner councils of the government during this period. The Committee was apparently unable to reach complete agreement within its own ranks, but, despite this, finally presented informally to SCAP on February 1, 1946 two documents entitled "Gist of the Revision of the Constitution" and "General Explanation of the Constitutional Revision Drafted by the Government."[12] These represent very limited revisions of the Meiji Constitution, and were perhaps intended by the Matsumoto Committee and the Japanese Government as a tentative and bargaining first approach to ascertain more precisely and concretely just what degree of constitutional change SCAP intended to require. They almost completely ignore, if indeed the Committee knew about, the specific areas of constitional reform recommended to Prince Konoe in October 1945 by George Atcheson, the Political Adviser to SCAP, and provide for very little constitutional change of any democratic significance. The underlying assumption seems to have been that the Meiji Constitution was itself capable of development along democratic lines and that only minor tinkering was necessary to achieve this. Given a government of the political and social persuasions of the Shidehara Cabinet and a committee in general reflective of these, this attitude is hardly surprising. Both were reluctantly responding to SCAP pressure in an area of the most fundamental importance; one can scarcely believe that, if left to their own devices, they would have engaged in any very extensive revision. From their standpoint, a posture of slow and cautious bargaining was obviously indicated in order to ascertain the specific nature and extent of SCAP's demands and the strength with which they were held. How else could they avoid the danger, as they saw it, of overcommitting themselves to unwanted democratic innovations? It seems, therefore, either curiously naive or calculated to entertain seriously the expectation that the first Matsumoto Draft would display any significant degree of democratic reform. Whatever the reasoning, the Supreme Commander reacted most adversely to these documents and on February 1, 1946 ordered General Whitney, Chief of his Government Section, to draft a detailed rejection of the Matsumoto proposals.

---

[9] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 90.

[10] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 91.

[11] See Satō Tatsuo, "Nihonkoku Kempō Seiritsushi," *Jurisuto*, No. 81 (May 1, 1955), p. 6; McNelly, *op. cit.*, p. 48; and Jones, Borton and Pearn, *op. cit.*, pp. 327–28. An allegedly accurate version of Konoe's suggestions appears in the *Mainichi Shimbun* for December 21, 1945.

Thus far the story of the origins of the new Japanese constitution is fairly clear and the principal facts generally agreed upon. The Supreme Commander was following quite literally the terms of his basic directive to support and encourage, but not to impose, democratic changes upon the Japanese. After February 1, 1946, however, developments took a new and surprising turn, important facts become most difficult to obtain, and conclusions must often, therefore, remain tentative. Despite such qualifications, materials recently published in Japan have yielded important fresh insights into what actually transpired.[13]

---

[12] The English texts of both of these are given in *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 2, pp. 617–21, together with the text of an unofficial but more complete draft which was "leaked to" and published by the *Mainichi Shimbun* on February 1, 1946 (pp. 611–16). This last is generally regarded as accurate.

[13] The following materials are particularly notable: 1) Miyazawa Toshiyoshi and Satō Isao, "MacArthur Kempō Sōan Kaisetsu [A Commentary on the MacArthur Draft Constitution]," *Kokka Gakkai Zasshi*, Vol. 68, Nos. 1 and 2 (Sept. 1954), pp. 1–6 and 1–37. The authors, stimulated by the earlier publication of an incomplete and somewhat garbled

On February 3, 1946, after further reflection on the whole matter of constitutional revision in the light of the unsatisfactory Matsumoto Committee proposals, General MacArthur concluded, in the words of the Government Section Report, that "the most effective method of instructing the Japanese Government on the nature and application of these principles he considered basic would be to prepare a model constitution embodying those principles."[14] On the same day he instructed General Whitney to have the Government Section draft such a constitution, extending full discretion as to its terms save that he stipulated three groups of points which he wanted incorporated. These included the first known version of the famous "no war" clause depriving Japan of armed forces and the right of belligerency, which eventually became Article 9 of the new constitution.[15] This decision to supply the Japanese with a model constitution was of fundamental importance, particularly because the resultant draft was, with remarkably few significant changes, to become the constitution of Japan.

The taking of so momentous a decision on this particular date—February 3, 1946—presents an interesting problem. As one follows the series of steps leading to the adoption of a new Japanese constitution, one is constantly troubled by the question of pace and timing. From the end of October 1945 to February 1, 1946 the Occupation authorities do not seem to have manifested any extraordinarily urgent concern about constitutional revision. One detects some impatience with the dilatory proceedings of the Matsumoto Committee, to be sure. But at the same time this was matched by a disposition to wait and see what sort of proposal the Japanese were going to make. Then suddenly about February 1 constitutional revision became a matter of the highest priority,

---

text by Dr. Watanabe Tetsuzō, here publish for the first time the official text of the original draft constitution prepared by SCAP and handed to the Japanese representatives on February 13, 1946. Both the original English version and the official Japanese translation are given. 2) Satō Tatsuo, "Nihonkoku Kempō Seiritsushi [History of the Formulation of the Japanese Constitution]" *Jurisuto*, Nos. 81 (May 1, 1955)+. Nineteen sizeable instalments of this marathon article had appeared in the columns of *Jurisuto* between May 1, 1955 and February 1, 1956, the last issue available to the writer. More are yet to come. The author was Chief of the First Section of the Cabinet Bureau of Legislation in early 1946, and, after February 26, served as Minister Matsumoto's chief assistant in drafting and revising the several Japanese versions of the constitution produced by the Government. He also conducted much of the vital liaison with SCAP on this matter. His opportunities for first-hand observation and for obtaining reliable information about the constitution were practically unparalleled. In general his story is carefully presented, consistent with what facts have been established, straightforward and plausible. 3) Satō Tatsuo, "Nihonkoku Kempō Tanjōki [A Record of the Birth of the Japanese Constitution]," *Toki no Hōrei*, Nos. 169 (May 3, 1944)+. This series, by the same author, had gone through fifteen installments, with more to come, by October 13, 1955, the last issue available to the writer. It is a less technical and more popularized version of essentially the same materials.

[14] *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 1, p. 102. For a more detailed account of this development, see below, pp. 992 *ff.*

[15] The text of these three points is given in *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 1, p. 102. See also Jones, Borton and Pearn, *op. cit.*, p. 330.

and within three weeks an entirely new constitution was drafted and accepted in principle by the Japanese Government. The question naturally arises as to why such frantic haste. The fundamental law of a great modern state was involved. This was certainly a matter of sufficient gravity to merit a somewhat more deliberate, dignified and careful procedure.

The question is rendered even more puzzling by General MacArthur's categorical assurance on January 30, 1946 to the visiting members of the Far Eastern Advisory Commision that he had ceased to take any action on constitutional reform and that, as a matter of fact, the entire issue had been taken out of his hands by the Moscow Agreement. This assurance was given two days before General Whitney submitted to General MacArthur a formal memorandum claiming to prove that SCAP had authority to proceed with constitutional reform, and four days before General MacArthur ordered his Government Section to produce a model constitution for the guidance of further Japanese efforts in this field. This official statement to the Far Eastern Advisory Commission is of sufficient interest to merit quotation:[16]

> On January 30 [1946] General MacArthur talked confidentially to the members in regard to the problems of the Occupation. As to the question of constitutional reform, he said that the matter had been taken out of his hands by the Moscow Agreement of December 26, 1945, which had set up the Far Eastern Commission. When he started out in Japan his original directive gave him jurisdiction in the matter but now he had ceased to take any action. He said that it was his hope that whatever might be done about constitutional reform would be done in such a way as to permit the Japanese to look upon the resulting document as a Japanese product, for he believed that only in this way could the work be permanent. He said that it was his conviction that a constitution, no matter how good, forced upon the Japanese by bayonets would last just as long as bayonets were present, and that he was certain that the moment force was withdrawn and the Japanese were left to their own devices they would get rid of that constitution, merely for the purpose of asserting and maintaining their independence of ideas that they had been forced to accept.

There seems to be a sizeable gap dividing the Supreme Commander's views expressed on January 30 and the action which he initiated on February 3. In the absence of clarification from General MacArthur or other high SCAP officials, the explanation of this gap can only be conjectured. The following considerations seem relevant, however, to the questions both of authority and timing which have been raised. They require some understanding of the general situation at this time.

III

Some competition appears to have developed among several United States and international agencies for the predominant influence over the general nature and formulation of the proposed new democratic constitution. This was occasionally so pronounced as to tempt a cynical observer to conclude that, of all possible candidates, only the Japanese Government displayed any reluctance to father this document. At various times the principal actors in this drama are said to have been the Department of State, the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC) through its Far Eastern Subcommittee, the Far Eastern Commission (FEC) and SCAP; indeed, it has been claimed beyond this that within SCAP there was a brief but bitter rivalry in 1945 between the Government Section and the Office of the Political Adviser, i.e. the Department of State's liaison officer with General MacArthur, over their respective roles in the revision of the Meiji Constitution.[17] Although the precise details of the interplay of these agencies are still to be made clear, a general outline of major developments may be attempted.

---

[16] U. S. Department of State, *The Far Eastern Commission* (Far Eastern Series 60; Washington, 1953), p. 44. The Far Eastern Advisory Commission was the inter-Allied agency initially charged with making recommendations on the implementation of the Japanese surrender terms.

Of the several rivalries involved, the most persistent and public was that between SCAP and the Far Eastern Commission. FEC was in the first instance the product of British and Soviet dissatisfaction with the authority of the already existing Far Eastern Advisory Commission. They desired a larger share in the formulation and execution of policy toward occupied Japan than had been allotted them. This they apparently obtained at the Moscow Meeting of Foreign Ministers on December 26, 1945. Here it was agreed to set up two rather complex international agencies, the Far Eastern Commission (FEC) with headquarters in Washington, D. C., and the Allied Council sitting in Tōkyō. While the latter had only advisory authority, the former was empowered "to formulate the policies, principles and standards in conformity with which the fulfillment by Japan of its obligations under the Terms of Surrender may be accomplished" and "to review, on the request of any member, any directive issued to SCAP or any action taken by the Supreme Commander involving policy decisions within the jurisdiction of the Commission." The dominant position of the United States was protected by its veto power and by the recognition of its authority to issue interim directives to SCAP "pending action by the Commission whenever urgent matters arise not covered by policies already formulated by the Commission; *provided that any directives dealing with fundamental changes in the Japanese constitutional structure or in the regime of control, or dealing with a change in the Japanese Government as a whole will be issued only following consultation and following the attainment of agreement in the Far Eastern Commission.*"[18] On this basis a multinational agency of eleven states was established in Washington on February 26, 1946.

Despite the date of its actual establishment, it will be noted that the Commission's terms of reference had been known to the governments concerned and to SCAP since the end of December 1945. It was quite obvious from these that the setting of policy on constitutional reform in Japan was not only to become a prerogative of the FEC but that its authority in this field was given special and protected status, since it was exempted from the scope of the United States' general right to issue "interim directives" on urgent matters. In other words it was clear by the end of December 1945, if not earlier, that if the United States, or any of its agencies such as SCAP, seriously intended to control the terms and forms of constitutional revision in Japan, it would be highly expedient to push the process as rapidly as possible. If not, a significant share of its authority might be preempted by the FEC. Once the Commission came into existence, it made abundantly clear its view that the determination of major policy on the revision of Japan's constitution was one of its prime concerns. It definitely resented what it viewed as SCAP's subversion of its authority in this field.[19]

---

[17] See Theodore H. McNelly, cited above, note 4, p. 43. Dr. McNelly claims that certain individuals in the Political Adviser's Office were working closely with the Konoe group on constitutional revision, and that this angered General MacArthur and induced him to order the Political Adviser's Office to cease its operations in this connection, thus leaving the field to the Government Section. See also Jones, Borton and Pearn, *op. cit.*, p. 328.

[18] Far Eastern Commission, Secretary-General, *Activities of the Far Eastern Commission, February 26, 1946–July 10, 1947* (Washington, 1947), pp. 37–38. Italics added.

The precise role of the Department of State and the interdepartmental planning agency bearing the ponderous title of State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee (SWNCC) in the development of this constitutional issue in Japan is more difficult to ascertain. It was fairly common knowledge in Washington during the early days of the Occupation that relations between the Department of State and SCAP were scarcely cordial. On several occasions the situation became acrimonious enough to spill into the press.[20] Despite such rivalry, however, there appears to have developed during January 1946 at least a limited, and perhaps coincidental, commonality of view between the State Department and SWNCC on the one hand and SCAP on the other upon the subject of constitutional revision. It seems probable that the basis for this unwonted consensus was their agreement on the need for constitutional reform in Japan, and their common preference that this be controlled ultimately by an American rather than an international agency. Given the existing international situation, this was, from the United States' standpoint, a quite reasonable preference. The difficulties of dealing with the Russians alone had already been elaborately demonstrated. Innumerable possibilities of discord, delay and unsatisfactory compromises might be attendant upon dealing with any multinational agency of the size and complexity of the FEC.

The attitude of SWNCC, which may safely be held to accord with that of the Department of State, is best exemplified in a policy paper entitled "Reform of the Japanese Governmental System" and identified as SWNCC-228. The origins of this document appear to go back at least to the spring of 1944,[21] thus attesting a long standing belief on the part of SWNCC and its predecessors in the Department of State and elsewhere that constitutional reform was essential in Japan. Beyond this, it seems probable that SWNCC may at this particular time have been seriously concerned over the possibility that General Mac-

---

[19] See U. S. Department of State, *The Far Eastern Commission*, op. cit., pp. 43–65; and Jones, Borton and Pearn, *op. cit.*, p. 351.

[20] See, for example, the *Washington Post* for September 20 and 23, 1945, or the *New York Times* for December 31, 1945 and January 1 and 2, 1946.

[21] The writer is indebted to Professor Borton for information on this score.

Arthur might carry through a project of constitutional reform on his own authority without extensive or formal reference to the views of the Committee or the Department of State. In this light, SWNCC-228 is to be interpreted in part as an attempt by the Committee to lay down broad lines of policy for the guidance of SCAP's activities in this field, thus insuring some consideration for the Committee's views. Finally it was doubtless intended, in part at least, as an American policy paper for use before the FEC. The statement was approved by the Committee itself on January 7, 1946 and forwarded to General MacArthur, not as a directive, but for his information, on January 11.

The text of SWNCC-228, insofar as it has been available, is also of considerable interest.[22] Since we are not presently concerned with the substantive recommendations of the Conclusions, suffice it to say that they supply for the Supreme Commander a list of general political objectives for Japanese governmental reform, e.g., a responsible government and executive branch, a representative and powerful legislative branch, a broad guarantee of civil rights, fiscal accountability, abolition or reform of the imperial institution, etc. Without exception, all of these formal recommendations were eventually embodied in the new Japanese constitution. However, the "Conclusions" contain no mention of Japan's permanent disarmament. To the contrary, the "Discussion" section, although speaking of the "abolition of the Japanese armed forces," anticipates their ultimate revival and recommends the advisability of formal action to obtain permanent subordination of the military to civilian control by requiring that ministers of state in all cases be civilians.

Of major present interest is the fact that the "Discussion" section of this paper does squarely, if not altogether satisfactorily, confront the problem raised by the several official Allied commitments to the effect that "The ultimate form of government of Japan shall, in accordance with the Potsdam Declaration, be established by the freely expressed will of the Japanese people." Its argument goes as follows:

> The Potsdam Declaration stipulates that the occupying forces shall not be withdrawn from Japan until a "peacefully inclined and responsible government" has been established. Past declarations of the United Nations, and the clear intention of the Allies permanently to eliminate Japanese practices and institutions which have made that country a danger to other nations, clearly indicate that that stipulation refers not merely to the particular Japanese Government which the Allies recognize prior to withdrawal, but also to the nature of Japan's governmental institutions. Although "the ultimate form of government of Japan" is to be determined by the "freely expressed will of the Japanese people," the Allies, in accordance with the above provision and as a part of their overall program for the demilitarization of Japan, are fully empowered to insist that Japanese basic law be so altered as to provide that in practice the government is responsible to the people, and that the civil is supreme over the military branch of the government.

---

[22] The Department of State has made available to the writer at least a sizeable portion of the text of those sections of SWNCC-228 entitled "Conclusions," "Facts Bearing on the Problem" and "Discussion." There are additional sections, but these have not been available for examination. With the exception of a brief and partial summary of the conclusions in the State Department report, *The Far Eastern Commission*, *op. cit.*, p. 45, this would seem to be the first time that this information has been released.

This is to say, of course, that certain of the terms upon which Japan surrendered are held by the United States to be more ultimate, more controlling than others, and specifically that the "freely expressed will of the Japanese people" guarantee is properly to be interpreted only within the context of and subordinate to other more basic terms and policies, and as a condition precedent to the termination of the Occupation. From a practical and legal standpoint this is probably a tenable position. Given the potentially contradictory terms of the Potsdam Declaration and the overriding need at the time for taking all steps calculated to insure as permanently as possible the peaceful and responsible character of the Japanese government, this was certainly the most probable position for the United States to take. Even so, however, there remains the problem of the ultimate Japanese reaction to such a stand. They may not concur in the long run and will probably choose instead to interpret the "freely expressed will" proviso as an absolute guarantee, and the United States' stand in SWNCC-228 as evasive, legalistic and essentially immoral—or "insincere," as they are more apt to say. The ambiguous and implicitly contradictory terms of the Potsdam Proclamation lend partial support to such a construction.

Thus SWNCC-228 seems to indicate that the Committee itself—speaking for the State, War and Navy Departments—had agreed: 1) that constitutional revision was necessary and desirable in Japan, 2) that the terms of surrender did not preclude the Allies from requiring such revision, and 3) that, while it was preferable that constitutional reforms be initiated by the Japanese, if they refused to do so, the Supreme Commander might "as a last resort" order the effectuation of a specific list of constitutional changes.[23]

Against this background we may examine next what is known about the Supreme Commander's attitude toward constitutional reform. We have already seen that, while General MacArthur is quoted as telling the Far Eastern Advisory Commission on January 30 that he had ceased to take any action in this field as a result of the Moscow Agreement, he apparently changed his mind within the space of the ensuing four days and initiated a number of moves which were to have sweeping consequences. In explaining this seeming change of mind, it must be remembered that SCAP's concern for constitutional reform did not begin suddenly in the opening days of February 1946. General MacArthur and his Government Section had been deliberately prodding and stimulating Japanese activity in this area since at least the preceding October. But it was not until February that the question came to be assigned an overriding priority, indeed to be treated as a crisis imperatively demanding solution within the shortest possible space of time.

---

[23] These points are summarized in Section 7 of the "Discussion" part of SWNCC-228 in the following language: "To have lasting value and hence to be most effective, the constitutional and administrative reforms necessary to correct the defects in Japan's governmental system should be initiated and carried into effect by the Japanese Government out of a desire to eliminate elements of the national structure which have brought Japan to its present pass and to comply with the provisions of the Potsdam Declaration. Failing such spontaneous action by the Japanese, the Supreme Commander should indicate the reforms which this Government considers necessary before it can consider a 'peacefully inclined and responsible government' to have been established in Japan, a condition of the Occupation forces' withdrawal. Only as a last resort should a formal instruction be issued to the Japanese Government specifying in detail the reforms to be effected."

A series of important developments began on February 1, 1946. First, General MacArthur ordered his Chief of Government Section, General Whitney to prepare a detailed rejection of the unsatisfactory constitutional proposals of the Matsumoto Committee. Next, General Whitney submitted to the Supreme Commander a lengthy and cogently reasoned memorandum setting forth his official opinion as to the extent of SCAP's authority "to deal with fundamental changes in the Japanese constitutional structure, either by approving or disapproving proposals made by the Japanese Government or by issuing orders or directives to that Government."[24] After considering the several issues of substance and procedure involved, General Whitney concludes that "in the absence of any policy decision by the Far Eastern Commission on the subject (which would, of course, be controlling), you have the same authority with reference to constitutional reform as you have with reference to any other matter of substance in the occupation and control of Japan." It is a well-reasoned brief and represents one quite plausible interpretation of the matter.

Sections Four, Five and Six of the memorandum are of particular interest. These concern the relative roles and authorities of the Supreme Commander and the Far Eastern Commission in the area of constitutional reform. They point out with force and clarity that although any policy directive which the Far Eastern Commission might promulgate on this subject would be controlling on SCAP: 1) General MacArthur's authority was unimpaired until such action by the FEC; and 2) if constitutional revision were originated not by Occupation fiat but by the Japanese government's submission of a reform project to SCAP, (which was an object of policy on substantive grounds), then General MacArthur's subsequent approval of this would not constitute an "order" by SCAP, and hence would not entail prior consultation with the Allied Council for Japan.[25] Thus without definitely recommending any specific form of action, this last clause suggests that, if it is desirable to avoid the intervention of an international body, this may in part be accomplished by arranging that constitutional reform be initiated in a technical sense by the Japanese rather than by SCAP.

Two days after the submission of this memorandum, i.e. on February 3, 1946, General MacArthur changed his mind about the handling of the Matsumoto Committee's proposals. The reasons for this sudden change are still unknown. The decision to draft a model constitution for the guidance of the

---

[24] The complete text of this interesting memorandum is given in *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 2, pp. 622–23. It is not known whether this advice was initiated by General Whitney or previously solicited by SCAP.

[25] The words of the memorandum were: "It is my opinion that the word 'order' in the charter of the Allied Council is used in the sense of compulsion and would not embrace a mere approval by you of constitutional reform measures submitted to you by the Japanese Government, although your action in approving the same would be subject to review by the FEC under the general review authority of its charter." *Op. cit.*, p. 623.

Japanese, while not a breach of any specific directive to SCAP, paid only lip service to the spirit of the injunction in SWNCC-228 that "only as a last resort should a formal instruction be issued to the Japanese Government specifying in detail the reforms to be effected." A variety of factors may have determined this change of attitude: It may have been due in part simply to cumulative irritation with Japanese dilatoriness or to the natural impatience of a man of action with governmental temporizing and international red tape. Beyond this, General Whitney's recent biography of General MacArthur confirms a further important consideration already suggested.

"When shortly thereafter," General Whitney's account states,[26]

> the State Department at the Big Three Foreign Ministers meeting in Moscow in December of 1945, surrendered the unilateral authority we were then exercising over Japan to an eleven-nation policy-making commission and gave the Soviet Union veto power over all policy incident to Japan, *MacArthur realized the urgency of immediate action under the powers he then held.*

If the Supreme Commander's Aide is accurately portraying his superior's views, this is an extraordinarily interesting statement. Such a view certainly disregards the spirit, if not the letter, of the obligations officially assumed by the United States at Moscow; it also illustrates how firmly the Army doctrine was established that a theater commander is entitled to the fullest freedom of action. Both the United States Government and the Supreme Commander by then had ample provocation and precedent of a practical sort to support this preference for speedy unilateral action. The Soviet attitude and abilities to exploit divisive and potentially explosive issues had already been made painfully and dangerously obvious in Western and Central Europe, and MacArthur's concern to avoid similar perils in Japan is certainly understandable.

As of early February 1946, it emerges, therefore, that the Supreme Commander felt strongly the necessity of prevailing upon the Japanese Government to accept a democratic constitution. It also was desirable on a variety of grounds that such a constitution not be imposed upon the Japanese by formal SCAP directive, but rather that it appear to be of official Japanese origin and be presented to SCAP by the Japanese Government as their own project for which they sought his approval and support. Since FEC was to be formally established in Washington probably before the end of February, time was of the essence. As it turned out, only by gaining Japan's acceptance in principle of a constitution prior to February 26 was it possible for SCAP to forestall possible intervention and to present the FEC with a *fait accompli.*

IV

When, on February 3, General MacArthur changed his mind, as has already been noted, he summoned General Whitney and ordered him "to prepare a draft constitution."[27] General Whitney at once returned to his Section and informed his three ranking officers—Colonel Charles L. Kades, Lieutenant Colonel Milo E. Rowell and Commander Alfred R. Hussey—of the Supreme Commander's decision. These men then devised a plan of procedure which was approved by General Whitney on February 4. Thereafter a general meeting of the Section's personnel (with the exception of the Korean Division) was called and General Whitney informed them, quite dramatically it is said, of the awesome responsibility which had been placed upon them.[28]

---

[26] Major General Courtney Whitney, *MacArthur, His Rendezvous with History* (New York, 1956), p. 247. Italics added.

[27] See *Political Reorientation,* vol. 1, p. 102.

Under conditions of the greatest secrecy, the Section then organized itself as a "constitutional assembly" composed of some 25 persons divided, with minor overlapping, into nine committees and a secretarial and interpreting service. In addition to General Whitney, four members of this group were lawyers, though none appears to have specialized in constitutional law; another was a former member of Congress, one a specialist in public administration, and two were academic figures—one an historian specializing in China and the other a sociologist with extensive prewar experience in Japan. None of them appears to have had any expert qualifications for the reasonably complex and technical job of drafting a constitution; none of them, with the exception of the two academic figures and one female staff member seems to have had any substantial prewar connection with or knowledge of Japan, its traditions and political institutions. This is not to impugn in any way the individuals involved; the task was a military assignment, certainly not of their own choosing. But it must be recognized that for so fundamental, and critical a task, their qualifications left a good deal to be desired.

The Government Section Report tells something of the labors which ensued.[29] They must in truth have been titanic. The working group consisted of 21 of the 25 Section members. These twenty-one were organized into nine committees: a Steering Committee with directive and coordinating functions, plus working committees on the Legislature; Executive; Judiciary; Civil Rights; Local Government; Finance; the Emperor, Treaties and Enabling Provisions; and the Preamble. One cannot but admire the enthusiasm and energy which all must have brought to their task. A variety of sources, mostly American, seem to have been briefly consulted, although one participant claims that the Soviet Constitution was also studied.[30] Their deliberations were further complicated by the fact that:[31]

> . . . those working on the problem had to bear in mind constantly that they were dealing not only with the abstract problem of writing a democratic constitution but that they were proposing the most far-reaching political reforms for an entire nation, and that, to the greatest extent feasible, the provisions and institutions should be designed to fit the

---

[28] One account claims that General Whitney began his statement with the words: "Ladies and gentlemen, this is an historic occasion. I now proclaim you a constitutional assembly." See Mark Gayn, *Japan Diary* (New York, 1948), p. 126; or H. E. Wildes, *Typhoon in Tokyo* (New York, 1954), p. 44.

[29] *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 1, pp. 102–05; see also McNelly, *op. cit.*, pp. 155–68; Gayn, *op. cit.*, pp. 126–29; Wildes, *op. cit.*, pp. 41–46; and Whitney, *op. cit.*, pp. 246–62.

[30] *Wildes*, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

[31] *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 1, p. 105.

> Japanese political picture. The document was to serve as a model or pattern, was to be presented as a statement of general principles but in such form that their application could be readily understood. Unless, however, the statement bore some relationship to the existing state of things, it was obvious that it would not serve its purpose.

A wise caution, certainly, although given the group's unfamiliarity with the legal and actual workings of Japan's political system, it is somewhat difficult to see how more than superficial observance could have been given it.

The "constituent assembly" seems to have operated under the strongest sort of pressure for rapid results. It is claimed that the original schedule called for a completed draft in ten days, and looked forward to its adoption within the ensuing eight days, on Washington's birthday, it was hoped.[32] Incredible to say, the first half of this fantastic schedule was actually bettered, the draft being completed on February 10, six days—and doubtless nights—after its commencement; while the Japanese Government actually did informally accept it in "basic principle" on February 22, thus establishing a curious symbolism hitherto appreciated by but a few of the immediate actors in this strange drama. This awesome display of speed and "efficiency" without a doubt represents the world's record time for the devising and acceptance of a constitution for a major modern state.

Upon completion, the draft constitution was presented to General MacArthur who approved it with but a single significant change.[33] The draft was then mimeographed in English on February 12 and presented to the Japanese at a meeting at the Foreign Minister's Residence on February 13, 1946. In the words of Japan's most recent and authoritative commentator on this whole development, this is "the date which should go down in history as the day on which the Japanese Constitution was conceived."[34]

This meeting of February 13 is of critical importance, the principal point at issue being the terms in which the Supreme Commander's officers presented the Government Section's "draft constitution" to the representatives of the Japanese Government. How permissive or how coercive were they? We do not yet have a detailed first-hand report from one or more of the participants, but the secondary accounts presently available yield the following picture.[35]

The meeting was held at 10 A.M. on February 13, 1946 at the Foreign Minister's official residence in Azabu. The Supreme Commander was represented by General Whitney, Colonel Charles L. Kades, Lieutenant-Colonel Milo E. Rowell and Commander Alfred R. Hussey, Jr. The Japanese group consisted of the then Foreign Minister Yoshida Shigeru, Minister of State Matsumoto Jōji, a member of the Foreign Ministry staff named Hasegawa, and Mr. Yoshida's confidential secretary Shirasu Jirō. The meeting had originally been requested by the Japanese for February 5 to discuss the Matsumoto proposals submitted to SCAP on February 1 and subsequently had been postponed for a week at their request. So far as they knew, its purpose was still to discuss Minister Matsumoto's recommendations for minimal revision of the constitution. The Government Section Report describes the events of the meeting in the following terms:[36]

---

[32] McNelly, *op. cit.*, p. 161; Wildes, *op. cit.*, p. 44; and Whitney, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

[33] *Political Reorientation,* Vol. 1, p. 105. The change seems to have involved the deletion of a provision forbidding any amendment to the constitution "impairing or altering the provision of the bill of rights." *Ibid.* p. 104.

[34] Satō Tatsuo, *op. cit.*, note 11 above, *Jurisuto*, No. 82 (May 15, 1955), p. 13.

[35] The following account is based primarily on the detailed version given by Satō Tatsuo in the two series of articles cited in footnote 13, and on the Government Section's and General Whitney's own versions in their respective works already cited. Mr. Satō was not himself present at the meeting of February 13, but he claims to base his account of it on Minister Matsumoto's own written summary of what was said, on conversations with Matsumoto, and on the stenographic records of recent discussions of this meeting by other actual participants and a number of well-informed Japanese before the Liberal Party's Constitutional Investigation Committee. See *Jurisuto, op. cit.*, No. 82, p. 12. See also Quigley and Turner, *op. cit.*, pp. 118–20.

> General Whitney informed the Japanese representatives that the proposals of the Matsumoto Committee were totally unacceptable, that they fell short of that broad and liberal reorganization of the Japanese governmental structure along democratic lines which the Allied Powers could regard as significant evidence that Japan had learned the lessons of war and defeat and was prepared to act as a responsible member of a peaceful community. He then stated that the Supreme Commander had caused to be prepared a detailed statement of those principles he deemed basic, that the statement was being presented to the Japanese Government in the form of a draft constitution, and that the Government was advised to give it the fullest consideration and use it as a guide in its renewed efforts to prepare a revised constitution. The Japanese were told that there was no compulsion upon them to take further action but that the Supreme Commander was determined that the constitutional issue should be brought before the people well in advance of the general election and that they should have full opportunity to discuss freely and freely express their will on constitutional reform. Failing action by the Cabinet, General MacArthur was prepared to lay the issue before the people himself.
>
> The only question that ensued involved the question of a unicameral legislature, which Dr. Matsumoto questioned. The Japanese appeared visibly surprised and disturbed and said they would have to consider the matter and discuss it with the Cabinet before any definite answer could be given.

So far as it goes, this seems to be a completely accurate statement of what transpired at the meeting. In itself and despite its explicit disclaimer of any intent to compel action by the Japanese Government in this matter, the account establishes the application of a very compelling pressure to obtain a favorable and speedy reaction from the Japanese Government. The threat to take the entire issue to the people over the Government's head was potent. Given the traditional distrust of Japanese officials for popular sovereignty in any form, rendered particularly acute at the moment by the country's desperate and tumultuous economic and social circumstances and the unprecedented scale of left-wing political activities, it is difficult to conceive of any more ominous development from the standpoint of Japanese officialdom than a constitution formulated in the "marketplace." The addition of the warning that SCAP intended that the issue of constitutional revision be brought before the people "well in advance of the general election" gave to this threat practically the force of an ultimatum. The statement was made on February 13. At the time the general election was scheduled for March 31, a bare 45 days later.

---

[36] *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 1, p. 105.

In his recent book General Whitney has expanded upon the official version of this threat to take the draft constitution to the people. He reveals that he made this statement without prior authorization from General MacArthur and was somewhat concerned as to whether his superior would approve of it. His account goes as follows:[37]

> Then I took a chance. With no prior authorization from MacArthur, I told the Japanese that while there was no compulsion upon them to take further action, the Supreme Commander was determined that the constitutional issue should be brought before the people well in advance of the general election. He felt, I explained, that they should have full opportunity to discuss and freely express their will on constitutional reform. Therefore, I said, if the cabinet were unable to prepare a suitable and acceptable draft before the elections, General MacArthur was prepared to lay this statement of principle directly before the people.
>
> The effect of this statement upon the Japanese representatives was immediately visible. Mr. Shirasu straightened up as if he had sat on something. Dr. Matsumoto sucked in his breath. Mr. Yoshida's face was a black cloud. . . .
>
> By the time we had left Mr. Yoshida's residence shortly thereafter, we were fairly convinced that our proposed draft would be accepted as the basis for the revised constitution. But my gratification at this was tempered by the realization that I had committed MacArthur to a political maneuver which he might consider rash [i.e. the threat to publish the draft]. . . .
>
> But I had known him long enough so that I should have realized what his answer would be . . . "Court," he said, "don't you know that I have never repudiated any action taken for me by a member of my staff? Right or wrong, whether I like it or not, I accept the situation as it stands and determine my next move from there." Nothing more was said on the subject.

This threat of publication might in itself have been enough to insure the compliance of the Shidehara Cabinet.

According to Mr. Satō's account, however, further and even stronger pressures were brought to bear. He attributes to General Whitney these additional statements which do not appear in either the official Government Section Report or General Whitney's own account: (1) That a constitution similar to that drafted by the Government Section would "without fail be accepted by SCAP, the United States [Government] and by the Far Eastern Commission as well."[38] (2) That "General MacArthur had for some time been considering most seriously the maintenance of the Emperor, but that it was essential to the accomplishment of this aim that the Japanese Government proclaim a revised constitution similar to the draft here being presented. If this was not done, *the person of the emperor could not be guaranteed.*"[39] After concluding on the rather remarkable note that SCAP was not "ordering" the Japanese Government to adopt such a constitution, General Whitney is then said to have given the Japanese twenty minutes in which to examine the draft constitution which had been presented to them.[40] He and his aides in the interim withdrew to the garden.

---

[37] Whitney, *op. cit.*, pp. 250-52.

[38] Satō, *Jurisuto*, No. 82, p. 13; *Tokino Hōrei*, No. 170, p. 15.

[39] *Ibid.* Italics added.

[40] General Whitney estimates the time as "about an hour." *Op. cit.*, p. 251.

After this break, the meeting resumed under somewhat melodramatic circumstances, described by General Whitney in the following terms:[41]

> . . . At the end of about an hour, I decided that we should rejoin our hosts, and we were rising as Mr. Shirasu reappeared.
>
> He seemed flustered by the drastic changes in our draft, and it occurred to me that this was an opportune moment to employ one more psychological shaft. I did not know the impressive support that I was about to receive from an unexpected quarter.
>
> As he mumbled apologies for keeping us waiting, I replied with a smile: "Not at all, Mr. Shirasu. We have been enjoying your atomic sunshine."
>
> And at that moment, with what could not have been better timing, a big B-29 came roaring over us. The reaction upon Mr. Shirasu was indescribable, but profound.
>
> When we seated ourselves across the patio from the committee members again, I could see that Mr. Shirasu's colleagues were as upset by our proposals as he was. . . .

Their perturbation is readily understandable. The conversations having been resumed on this heavy-handed note, Matsumoto, after trying to ascertain the reasons for which a unicameral legislature was being recommended, explained that they would have to study the draft constitution and consult with their colleagues. Their visitors then departed. According to Mr. Satō, the meeting had lasted for slightly over an hour.

The attitude subsequently adopted by the Japanese Government testifies to the persuasiveness of the pressures which SCAP's representatives are said to have exerted at this meeting. Their full force should be appreciated. First, the statement attributed to General Whitney that a Japanese Constitution similar to the Government Section model would "without fail be accepted by SCAP, the United States and by the Far Eastern Commission" placed the Japanese in a very difficult position.[42] They were told that the Allied Powers intended to insist on extensive constitutional revision. They were in effect offered a choice between accepting the model provided by SCAP's Government Section or of embarking on the uncertainties of drafting a variant version more to their liking. They were assured of SCAP's approval and support of its document and officially informed that it would also be accepted by the top Allied anthorities. Moreover, a specific and detailed constitution was before them. Without a doubt, it was most unpalatable, but at least they knew the worst of its terms. If they were to reject the Government Section Draft and set out to write their own constitution, they might seriously jeopardize the good will of the Supreme Commander and of his Government Section. These were perhaps the most important agencies in Japan at that time and for an unpredictable number of years to come; no responsible Japanese officials would lightly incur such a risk. Second, if they were to write their own constitution at some later date, it would then have to be approved in the first instance by SCAP and his Government Section. Would they approve any version not substantially similar to the Government Section Draft? The Japanese could only guess at what positive gains might ultimately accrue from delay. Third, if they delayed for more than a week or two, the Far Eastern Commission could be expected to have come into official existence and operation. The Japanese were quite well aware that the FEC was intended as a policy-determining agency for the Occupation, with a special interest and authority in the field of constitutional reform. Did they prefer to deal with the known dangers presented by SCAP, or the unknown perils of a remote and complex international agency of which the USSR was a prominent and powerful member?

---

[41] *Ibid.*,

[42] If such a statement was made, one cannot refrain from wondering by virtue of what authority or prescience General Whitney could thus commit the still nonexistent FEC to the approval of a document it had never seen.

The most decisive pressure said to have been brought against them is, however, the threat to "the person of the Emperor."[43] If such a threat was made, one can understand far better the docility of the Japanese in the remaining negotiations on constitutional revision. It is only necessary to recall that when they accepted the terms of surrender set forth at Potsdam, they attempted to make but a single stipulation that "the said declaration [of Potsdam] does not comprise any demand which prejudices the prerogatives of His Majesty as a Sovereign Ruler." Their overruling concern was to salvage at least the imperial system from the ruins of national defeat.

The wording of this "threat" is also of interest: "the person of the Emperor could not be guaranteed." The inference from this was a potential menace not to the imperial system but to the present emperor individually. There was already some uncertainty over the degree of protection afforded the imperial system—not the reigning emperor—by the Allies' evasive reply to Japan's qualified acceptance of the Potsdam terms. This particular phrasing of the "threat" therefore could hardly have been more skillfully chosen. It does not raise the difficult question of the fate of the system as such, but confines itself to the fate of the individual, Hirohito, the Shōwa Emperor. It does this, furthermore, at a time when there was a strong segment of official and public opinion in the victorious Allied countries in favor of forcing the Emperor to stand trial before an international tribunal as Japan's foremost "war criminal." The attitude adopted by SCAP on this issue could well have been of critical importance. If speed, secrecy and docile acquiescence in the terms of an American-drawn constitution were the price of the Supreme Commander's favor, the official reaction might very well have been—to use the words of the Imperial Rescript ending the war—"to endure the unendurable and suffer what is insufferable."

The pressures, once applied, are said to have been maintained. Matsumoto reported immediately to Premier Shidehara and thereafter set to work on a revised explanation of the Matsumoto Draft, hoping this might serve for further negotiation. When Shirasu Jirō took this to Headquarters on February 18, he was informed there was no possibility at all of the Matsumoto Draft being considered. More significantly, Mr. Satō says that Shirasu was told at this time that "whether or not there was any intent [among the Japanese] to make progress on the basis of the Headquarters Draft should be demonstrated by the twentieth. If not, the Headquarters Draft would be published."[44] This implies in effect a two-day ultimatum.

---

[43] Mr. Satō is very specific about the wording of this alleged threat, even to the extent of supplying the English phrase "person of the Emperor" in its kana equivalent.

It was only at this point, on February 19, that the Japanese cabinet was officially informed of the pending negotiations and the gist of the terms of the MacArthur Draft. Following the cabinet meeting Shidehara himself had an audience with General MacArthur to make quite certain of his current intentions and to ask for an extension of the "ultimatum" to February 22. The premier had a further interview with General MacArthur on February 21 and reported the results to a cabinet meeting on the twenty-second. It was at this meeting that the Japanese Government decided officially that Minister Matsumoto should visit Headquarters that afternoon and "accept the so-called basic principles set forth at the meeting of the thirteenth," as well as explore more fully the subject of "basic form." Matsumoto acted accordingly and returned from an hour and forty minute conference with General Whitney and four of his aides most disappointed that "they had shown practically no inclination to compromise." So on Washington's birthday, the Japanese Government agreed in principle to draft a constitution following closely the terms of the so-called "MacArthur Draft" of February 13, 1946. It was just ten days since the Japanese representatives were first shown the American draft.

Considerations of space preclude detailed analysis here of the terms of the MacArthur Draft compared to those of the several ensuing "Japanese" Drafts.[45] Suffice it to say that it provided for Japan a curious amalgam of the British and American systems of government. The Emperor was stripped of all power, theoretical as well as actual, and left simply as "the symbol of the State and of the unity of the people." The "sovereignty" of the popular will was asserted. A unicameral legislature was created and designated as "the highest organ of state power" and the "sole lawmaking authority of the State." A cabinet on the British model was established and linked to the legislature in normal parliamentary fashion, save for the addition of an ambiguous and potentially troublesome statement vesting plenary "executive power" in the Cabinet. The judiciary chapter was plainly drawn from American experience and vested "the whole judicial power" in "a Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as the Diet may from time to time establish." Article 73 even granted to the Supreme Court final power of judcial review in all cases arising under the civil rights chapter of the Constitution and very extensive powers to review the constitutionality of laws, ordinances and official acts in all other cases. The third chapter embodied what is perhaps the world's most extensive constitutional guarantees of civil rights. Besides all of the normal protections, this extends to freedom of thought and conscience, academic freedom, the essential equality of the sexes, social security, and the right to work. Most unusual of all, however, was Chapter II on the "Renunciation of War." In wording this follows in general the text provided by General MacArthur when he instructed the Government Section to draft a model constitution.[46] By its terms Japan renounced its sovereign right to make war or to use force or threats of force as a means of settling international disputes. Beyond this, it also stated that "no army, navy, air force or other war potential will ever be authorized" or any rights of belligerency conferred upon the State.

---

[44] *Jurisuto,* No. 82, p. 14.

[45] A Japanese text of the MacArthur Draft (in the Foreign Ministry's translation of the original English version) is given in *Jurisuto,* No. 82, pp. 14–18. English and Japanese versions are also available in T. Miyazawa and I. Satō, *op. cit.,* note 13 above, pp. 1–37 of separately paged appendix.

This brief statement of major provisions does scant justice to one of the more remarkable constitutional endeavors of our time. Viewed in an abstract and technical sense, there is little that is mechanically wrong or inoperable about the document, despite the jumble of institutions not usually found together. It is a "textbook constitution," such as might be expected from a small group of earnest, well intentioned men having few professional qualifications for their task, even less specialized knowledge of the Japanese political system, and working under intense pressure. In such circumstances it is all too easy for a combination of democratic idealism and concern for short term tactical objectives to overshadow long range considerations and the unpalatable socio-political facts of the situation. Despite protestations to the contrary, this seems to be what happened in SCAP during these hectic early weeks of February 1946. The Government Section patched together an almost ideally democratic constitution, one that could scarcely have gained serious consideration if advocated for adoption in the United States. It had even less relevance to the traditional and dominant political aspirations or practices of Japan.

Events after February 22 continued to move rapidly. In strict secrecy the Japanese began on February 26 to prepare what is known as the First Japanese Government Draft of the Constitution. Under strong pressure from SCAP, this was completed on March 2—nine days earlier than originally scheduled—and delivered to the Government Section at 10 A.M. on March 4.[47] The negotiating session which ensued between Japanese and American representatives lasted with but minor interruptions for thirty hours, until 4 P.M., March 5. During this period the First Japanese Draft and a lengthy explanation of it by Minister Matsumoto were translated into English. Government Section officials then objected to a number of proposed changes from the MacArthur Draft. Resolution of these issues took up the remainder of the night and most of the next day.[48] During this session the Japanese gained SCAP's consent to the substitution of a bicameral for a unicameral national assembly; they got very few other concessions of any significance. The product of this marathon meeting was a third draft, the so-called "Second Japanese Government Draft" or the "Cabinet Draft." The English text was controlling and—save for the substitution of a bicameral legislature—as a whole bears a closer resemblance to the "MacArthur Draft" than to the intermediate "First Japanese Government Draft" of March 2.[49]

---

[46] See p. 986, above.

[47] An English translation of this is available in *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 2, pp. 625–30. The original Japanese text is in *Jurisuto*, No. 83, (June 1, 1955) pp. 12–16.

[48] The Japanese representatives seem to have been quite willing to proceed at a more decorous pace, but Mr. Satō claims that they were informed about 6 P.M. on March 4 that General Whitney, with the imminence of the general election in mind, wanted immediate results and was prepared to wait till midnight for a firm draft, and, if this was not long enough, until 6 A.M. Under such pressure, the exhausted Japanese, abandoned after the first half-hour by their leader, Matsumoto—who claimed to be ill—had no choice but to continue through the night. After Matsumoto's early departure, the Japanese seem to have been represented principally, if not entirely, by Shirasu Jirō (confidential secretary to the

The Japanese Cabinet met more or less continuously throughout the day and evening of March 5. As it became available from the meeting at Headquarters, the text of the "Second Japanese Government Draft" was presented to them. It is said that Premier Shidehara and other ministers burst into tears upon reading it.[50] Seeing no practicable alternative, however, they decided to submit it to the Emperor. Premier Shidehara did this at 5 P.M. and the Emperor promptly issued an Imperial Rescript stating that:[51]

> It is therefore my desire that the constitution of our Empire be revised drastically upon the basis of the general will of the people and the principle of respect for fundamental human rights. I command hereby the competent authorities of my Government to put forth in conformity with my wish their best efforts towards the accomplishment of this end.

On March 6 the text of this new draft was published in both Japanese and English. General MacArthur immediately made known his strong approval:[52]

> It is with a sense of deep satisfaction that I am today able to announce a decision of the Emperor and Government of Japan to submit to the Japanese people a new and enlightened Constitution which has my full approval. This instrument has been drafted after painstaking investigation and frequent conference between members of the Japanese Government and this Headquarters following my initial direction to the Cabinet five months ago. . . .

Some three and a half months later—on June 21, 1946—on the occasion of the submission of the Draft Constitution to the Diet, the Supreme Commander issued another public statement in which he said in part:[53]

> . . . The Government Draft now before the Diet is a Japanese document and it is for the

---

Foreign Minister), Satō Tatsuo (of the Cabinet Bureau of Legislation), and Hasegawa Genkichi and Obata Kunryō (two officials from the Foreign Ministry). At least sixteen officers of the Government Section plus a number of Nisei translators and interpreters were arrayed against this small group. General Whitney appeared only after the work was completed late in the afternoon of March 5 and then only to express his great pleasure at the nature of the results—a sentiment which, as Satō wryly says, was hardly shared by the Japanese. Both he and General MacArthur, however, were in constant indirect communication with the negotiators. They received, and apparently approved of, each article as it emerged from the meeting at the Government Section, as did Minister Matsumoto also. General MacArthur had approved the entire draft by 5:30 P.M., March 5—about the same time as the Emperor did. See Whitney, *op. cit.*, pp. 254–55.

[49] An English version of this draft is printed in *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 2, pp. 631–36. The Japanese text may be found in *Jurisuto*, No. 86 (July, 15 1955), pp. 52–56.

[50] Satō in *Jurisuto*, No. 88 (August 15, 1955), p. 34.

[51] SCAP, *Summation* of *Non-Military Activities*, March 1946, p. 18.

[52] *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 2, p. 657.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 660.

people of Japan, acting through their duly elected representatives, to determine its form and content—whether it be adopted, modified or rejected. . . .

The publication of the "Second Japanese Government Draft" on March 6 was the first public intimation that decisive official action in this sphere was imminent. All proceedings until this time had been conducted in the strictest secrecy by both SCAP and the Japanese Government. The U. S. Department of State had not seen the draft constitution before its publication. There is no indication that any other branch of the U. S. government was consulted in any significant manner or shown any of the constitutional drafts.[54] The FEC was completely surprised by the publication of the March 5 Draft.[55] Secretary Byrnes announced on March 12 that the new constitution would be submitted to the FEC before final adoption. Judging from press comments, the Japanese public was equally surprised by this specific development, although a general public discussion of desirable constitutional changes had been going on for several months. Japanese newspaper and political reaction—with the exception of the Communist Party—was in general distinctly favorable. Mixed with this pleasure, however, was a veiled but detectable incredulity that so liberal a document had been the product of the Shidehara Government. The more sophisticated readers were left in little doubt that SCAP's role in its formulation must have been considerably more than advisory and consultative. Mass reaction is more difficult to determine with any accuracy. Among other obstacles, adequate popular comprehension of the draft constitution was impeded by the fact that the March 5 Draft was written in *bungotai*, a technical literary form of the language generally used in official documents but difficult for the average Japanese to understand.[56] A concerted publicity campaign was launched, however, to explain and popularize the March 5 Draft.

For present purposes the remainder of the Constitution's history may be speedily recounted. Following the publication of the March 5 Draft, popular attention centered upon the campaign for the April 10, 1946 general election of members of the House of Representatives. It was SCAP's plan that this should serve in effect as a popular referendum, with the proposed new constitution the principal policy issue at stake.[57] Actually this was not the case. All parties save the Communist approved the draft constitution in principle, but popular interest seems to have focussed primarily on more mundane problems of national and individual livelihood and subsistence, and on the great number of bitter personal and party contests for Diet seats. It is difficult to regard the results as a reliable expression of popular views on the constitution.

---

[54] See Jones, Borton and Pearn, *op. cit.*, p. 341.

[55] See McNelly, *op. cit.*, pp. 226–27.

[56] At SCAP's insistence, the April 17, 1946 and subsequent drafts of the new constitution were written in ordinary Japanese. This occurred after the general election of April 10, however.

[57] It was widely claimed in Washington, D. C. at this time that both the Department of State and the Far Eastern Commission strongly disapproved of this plan and were urging some more specific consultation of Japanese public opinion with respect to the constitution, perhaps in the form of a special constitutional assembly or referendum. See Jones, Borton and Pearn, *op. cit.*, p. 342.

On April 15 the Japanese Government submitted what is known as the "Third Japanese Government Draft" to SCAP.[58] The most notable change here was the use of colloquial Japanese rather than the formal *bungotai*, but a number of minor alterations of language and detail were made. SCAP accepted these and the draft was published on April 17. The same day it was submitted to the Privy Council for its scrutiny and approval, a procedure mandatory for all bills of constitutional amendment under the Meiji Constitution. On April 22 the Privy Council commenced its deliberations on the Draft, only to be interrupted on May 24 when the newly constituted Yoshida Cabinet briefly withdrew the Draft to make some minor changes. Resubmitted on May 25, it was approved by the Privy Council—by a less than unanimous vote—on June 8, 1946.

On June 20 a "Fourth Japanese Government Draft," with slightly altered style and terminology, was formally introduced as a bill of constitutional amendment into the House of Representatives at the newly convoked Ninetieth Session of the Imperial Diet.[59] From June 25 to 28 this bill was debated before a plenary session of the lower house. From July 1 to August 21 it was considered by two committees, a Special Committee of 72 members representing the various parties in the House in proportion to their strength, and a smaller 14 member Subcommittee which actually formulated all changes made in the original bill. The amendments so recommended—all accepted by the lower house—involved changes in the Preamble and twenty-two articles of the draft constitution, as well as the deletion of one and the addition of four new articles. A number of minor verbal changes were also made.[60] Throughout, the Government Section was consulted and all proposed changes "were checked with" it.[61] On August 21 hearings before the lower house sitting as a Committee of the Whole were resumed, and on August 24 all changes recommended by the Special Committee were approved and the amended bill was adopted by a vote of 421 to 8. Six of the eight opponents were Communists. The bill was then sent to the House of Peers.

---

[58] The English text is printed in *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 2, pp. 637–42.

[59] The English text is available *ibid.*, pp. 643–48. Technically this took the form of a bill of total amendment to the Meiji Constitution. To avoid charges of illegality or the occurrence of a constitutional interregnum, SCAP was most insistent that the procedure of amendment specified in Article 73 of the Meiji Constitution be literally followed. Whether in fact it was so followed rests primarily upon whether or not under the Meiji Constitution the Diet had the power to amend an Imperial project of constitutional amendment. Japanese legal authorities are in disagreement on this matter. For SCAP's views, see Dr. Oppler's memorandum to the Government Section, *ibid.*, pp. 662–66.

[60] A list of these changes may be found in Satō Isao, *Kempō Kaisei no Keika* [The Development of Constitutional Revision], Tōkyō, Nippon Hyōronsha, 1947, pp. 349–57. See also McNelly, *op. cit.*, pp. 332–39.

[61] *Political Reorientation*, Vol. 1, p. 111. What degree of positive influence or control was involved in this "checking" is hard to say. The Government Section does not seem to have been displeased with any of the results.

The House of Peers—by this time somewhat reconstituted as a result of SCAP's purge directives—began its consideration of the Bill of Revision on August 26. On August 31 it was sent to a Special Committee of 45 members for more intensive examination. On September 26 it was referred to a 15-member Subcommittee, which on October 3 recommended three amendments. These were accepted by a substantial majority of a plenary session of the House of Peers on October 6, and the amended Bill was returned to the House of Representatives for its concurrence. The lower house gave this on October 7, with only five members (including four Communists) known to have voted against it. The amended Bill was then resubmitted to the Privy Council which accepted the changes on October 29. On November 3, 1946 the Emperor formally promulgated the new "Constitution of Japan (Nihonkoku Kempō)," to take effect six months later on May 3, 1947.

The one-sided votes in both Houses of the Diet give a most misleading impression of the actual course of debate. The reservations and misgivings expressed on the floors of both Houses and in their committees were numerous and grave. Many members evidently did not regard either the Cabinet or themselves as having a completely free choice. In the House of Peers in particular one frequently detects a distinct preference for many of the institutions and practices of the Meiji Constitution. Under the circumstances it is most difficult to assess accurately the true sentiments of the national legislature. Its members were neither ignorant of nor insensitive to the considerations of national interest which seem earlier to have determined the views and actions of the Shidehara Cabinet. Japan was under military occupation; SCAP and the Government Section were generally recognized in sophisticated political circles as the real authors of this constitution and its strongest proponents; the Japanese Government was already committed in principle; and the Government could always wield the weapon of dissolution against any large scale opposition in the lower house. Finally, SCAP's very thoroughgoing political purge in the spring and summer of 1946 had drastically affected the national political scene in terms of personnel, organization and attitudes; and the threat of further purges was very real. These were circumstances scarcely calculated to produce in the national legislature a full, free and uninhibited expression of views on so sensitive an issue—particularly at the voting stage. These considerations of course, weighed differently with various parties and individuals. They affected least the socialist and so-called "proletarian" elements which in general strongly and genuinely favored the new constitution. But they bore with particular strength upon the dominant conservative element of the membership, and it is here in particular that the representative quality of the Diet's voting and action is open to question.

While the draft constitution was before the Diet, SCAP's concern continued to be actively asserted. In the words of the Government Section Report: "Consultations were carried on almost continuously, and all proposed amendments were checked with Government Section, but only on one occasion did the Supreme Commander instruct the Japanese Government to take any specific step."[62] Mr. Satō's account confirms the continuous scrutiny and clearance of amendments by the Government Section and intimates pressure on the Diet to adopt some of them.[63] It is doubtful whether any more explicit orders would have been necessary. With the single exception noted, no order or instruction is known to have been issued to the Japanese Government during the whole process.

The single instance was stimulated by the Far Eastern Commission. When the FEC's committees were organized on March 14, 1946, they found that the Japanese Government had already issued—eight days earlier—a draft constitution which General MacArthur had strongly endorsed in a public statement. The FEC could do little save to adopt on July 2 a policy decision entitled "Basic Principles for a New Japanese Constitution,"[64] substantially identical with the earlier SWNCC-228 of January 7, 1946. The FEC continued to discuss Japanese constitutional reform on a number of occasions throughout the year, often in a context indicating their disapproval of SCAP's course. As a result, several other directives were sent to General MacArthur. These referred primarily to the FEC's determination that it should have a right ultimately to review any new Japanese Constitution, that all cabinet ministers should be civilians, and that a majority of the Ministers of State should be members of the Diet.[65] The last two of these required changes in the text of the draft constitution, which SCAP prevailed upon the Japanese to accept before the new constitution was formally promulgated on November 3, 1946.

In the end, how closely does the new Japanese Constitution resemble the original "MacArthur Draft?" It is difficult to answer that question definitively. Some of the differences between the two documents are so subtle that they do not even appear in a translated version; they rest upon the selection of delicately shaded terms and phrases in Japanese or upon the peculiarities of Japanese grammar. Others continue to be debated in Japanese legal circles, and the experts themselves are undecided as to a proper interpretation of the points at issue. Such subtleties aside, the prevailing impression is the extremely faithful manner in which the terms of the present constitution mirror those of the original Government Section Draft.

The similarity begins with such obvious matters as style, wording and the internal ordering of the chapters and articles. Despite a considerable number of changes of detail in wording, no one reading the two texts could be in doubt that the relationship is very close. This sense of substantial identity in a literary way is heightened—for anyone possessed of some familiarity with the style of Japanese public documents—by the unmistakable alien and American quality of the language in both. This fact alone has occasioned a certain amount of literary anguish among sophisticated Japanese; the style is simply not good Japanese. It was even necessary to invent new ideographic compounds to express certain of the concepts expressed, so foreign were they to Japanese patterns of thought. Beyond this, a study of the allusions and literary sources of the language in the preambles of both drafts is illuminating. A partial listing would include the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Gettysburg Address, the Atlantic Charter and General MacArthur. No analogous references to the Japanese literary heritage occur.[66] Throughout both versions of the constitution the wording, style and even the punctuation are almost always very similar and, more often than not, substantially identical.

---

[62] *Ibid.*

[63] See, for example, *Toki no Hōrei*, No. 178 (Aug. 3, 1955), p. 18, or Satō Isao, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

[64] The text is in *Activities of the Far Eastern Commission, February 26, 1946–July 10, 1947*. Department of State Publication 2888 (Washington, 1947), pp. 65–66.

[65] *Ibid.*, pp. 65–68, and *Political Reorientation* Vol. 1, p. 111 and Vol. 2, pp. 661 and 667–68.

In an institutional sense there are two especially prominent differences between the two drafts. The first and perhaps the most significant is the substitution of a bicameral national legislature for the unicameral body originally favored by the Government Section. This involved, of course, a good deal of corollary adjustment in other related sections. While making some concession to Japanese views in this respect, SCAP still did not endorse the type of bicameral assembly which the Japanese really wanted. Their project had called for an upper house based on the "corporative" and professional elements in society. SCAP rejected this however, in favor of an upper house based essentially on the usual geographic and demographic factors.

The second major institutional change has to do with the Supreme Court and its right to review issues of constitutionality. The "MacArthur Draft" had originally specified that the power of judicial review should be final only with respect to cases arising under or involving the civil rights chapter of the constitution. Rulings on constitutionality in other spheres might be set aside by a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of the Diet. In the course of the all-night negotiations at the Government Section on March 4–5, this wording was discarded in favor of a general and unqualified grant of power to the Supreme Court "to determine the constitutionality of any law, order, regulation or official act." This wording remained through all subsequent versions of the constitution.

A number of other less conspicuous differences appear between the two drafts. The final version contains a stronger and more explicit statement of popular sovereignty. Article 9, the "renunciation of war" clause, has changes in wording, the precise effects of which are still moot. The civil rights chapter, elaborate to begin with, has been even further refined and expanded. Specific clauses have been added requiring that the Premier and a majority of the ministers of state be Diet members, and that the Premier and all ministers must be civilians. The early requirement that the Premier's appointees to cabinet status must receive Diet approval has been deleted, as has an article conferring original jurisdiction in certain cases upon the Supreme Court. A guarantee of universal adult suffrage has been added, and the provisions concerning the financial status of the Imperial House have been strengthened. Finally an explicit statement of the principle of local autonomy has been added. These appear to be the more important substantive changes. Perhaps they sound more impressive than they really are. The changes noted here relate to but a very small fraction of the constitution's 103 articles. The basic concepts, institutions and practices originally conceived by the Government Section and embodied in the so-called "MacArthur Draft" are in almost all cases substantially identical in content, style and wording to the provisions of the present Constitution of Japan.

---

[66] See McNelly, *op. cit.*, pp. 203–05.

V

The essentially American origins of the present Japanese constitution raise questions reaching far beyond the historical concern for setting the record straight. For better or worse, actions were taken that cannot now be undone. Their consequences are of continuing and positive importance and the lessons to be drawn from the entire episode are still clouded with uncertainties.

In the first place, the entire process of clandestine American influence on the style, content and adoption of the Japanese constitution poses in acute fashion the issue of the degree of independence and autonomous power in the political sphere which should be accorded to the military commanders of overseas theatres or occupied areas after hostilities have ceased. Neither the State-War-Navy Coordinating Committee nor any other civilian agency of the Government saw the specific or complete terms of any constitutional drafts prior to their publication on March 6, 1946. Recognizing the American military tradition of freedom of action for theater commanders, and bearing in mind the weakness of the State Department in top councils throughout the war, one still can only marvel at the degree of freedom permitted to or taken by the Supreme Commander in this highly political matter.

It is difficult to conceive of any other single action of the Allied Occupation of Japan comparable in external or internal importance to the formulation of the new constitution. So far as is known the effective support for the quixotic Article 9, the "renunciation of war" section, derived solely from General MacArthur. No other branch of the United States Government and no responsible Japanese ministry or agency is known to have even considered such a clause prior to February 13, 1946. Yet this decision alone has constituted a most serious and continuing impediment to the United States' military and diplomatic world strategy since 1947–48 at least. The responsibility for this would seem—in the light of the present evidence—to rest squarely on the Supreme Commander's shoulders.

Would prior consultation with the Department of State or SWNCC have avoided this outcome? For a complex of reasons the influence of the Department was in eclipse during the war. But it is very hard to imagine the staff of the Department assenting, even in February 1946, to the permanent and constitutional disarmament of Japan. It is equally difficult to conceive of a professional diplomat imagining that General Whitney's heavy handed "psychological shafts"—which he seemed to confuse with diplomacy—provided an appropriate or durable foundation for a democratic political order in Japan. There is nothing inherent in the administrative nature of a military occupation which renders it impossible to confer some jurisdication in such fundamental political cases upon the civilian and more professionally qualified branches of the national service.

Our failure to do so in Japan seems to have contributed in an important degree to a second development of continuing concern to American national policy, the growing movement for revision of the "MacArthur Constitution."[67] The so-called "conservative elements" in Japanese politics, which have since the war controlled about two-thirds of the popular vote and of the seats in the national House of Representatives, have never made any secret of their distaste for the present constitution. As the Occupation drew to a close in 1952 and Japan regained her independence, they became increasingly vocal on this score. Since 1952 constitutional revision has been openly advocated by major conservative groups in every general election, and today the Hatoyama Government is engaged in forming a special committee of Diet members and experts to investigate the precise form which revision should take.[68] The newly consolidated Government Party, the Liberal-Democrats, is seriously working for revision of the election law in order, it is widely alleged, to maximize its chances of obtaining more than the two-thirds majorities in both Houses of the Diet required for the initiation of any constitutional amendment.[69]

It remains to be seen whether their losses in the 1956 elections postpone indefinitely the passage of any bill of revision by the Diet. But the constitution further requires a popular referendum on any proposed amendment. At this point the grounds upon which revision is to be presented to the Japanese electorate would become important. The revisionist appeal to the public has been based on multiple grounds, including the claim that the constitution was "made in America" and imposed upon an unwilling Japanese Government by the Occupation authorities, together with nostalgia for a more dignified status for the Emperor. Thus far the Government has used this potentially explosive appeal to nationalistic sentiments with marked circumspection. But the entire constitutional story is so ideally suited to extremist agitation that it may be hard to keep its popular presentation within the moderate bounds the present Japanese Government would probably prefer. The United States may therefore have cause to regret afresh the impulsive actions of its agents in 1946, for the animus of such a campaign must necessarily be anti-American.

---

[67] For a more detailed account of this, see the present writer's "The Constitution and Current Japanese Politics," in the *Far Eastern Survey*, vol. 25, No. 4 (April 1956), pp. 49–58.

[68] The Socialist Party has formally declared that it will not participate in the work of this Committee, despite the fact that its establishment was specifically authorized by the Diet in early 1956. *The Japan Times*, August 11, 1956.

[69] See, for example, *Mainichi Shimbun* for December 20, 1955, or the *New York Times* for March 20, 1956.

Most serious of all, however, is the damage this constitution may have done to the very cause it was intended to serve—the democratization of Japan. By imposing upon the Japanese a constitution hopelessly unsuited to the political ideals or experience of the vast majority of the population, the long term interests of democracy may have been ill served. Instead of a system of government based upon and geared to the social, economic and political realities of Japanese society, a hollow but elaborate façade modelled after an idealized version of Anglo-American political institutions was hastily patched together. The result is an enormous gap between political fact and constitutional fiction, the true extent of which has been carefully concealed by a variety of devices. This is not to say that real and important changes in what we would regard as a "progressive" direction have not occurred under the new constitution. They have, and the terms of political competition in Japan have been profoundly affected in several ways of lasting significance. But in general the older and more traditional political views and practices not only survived but grew stronger and bolder after a lean and cautious period during the early years of the Occupation. Since their exponents have controlled postwar Japanese governments with but a single brief exception, actual governmental practice has consistently deviated in numerous important respects from what the constitution and its supporting legal system said it should be. This discrepancy has bred a hypocritical attitude towards the constitution and law in general. Inconvenient constitutional provisions have too often tended to become simply a challenge to administrative ingenuity to invent ways of subverting their intent. In this process democratic institutions and the popular regard for them suffer. The revisionist argument is that postwar Japan has been afflicted by too much democracy and that in important respects the traditional institutions, or a modified version of them, are better. The claim is heard with increasing frequency that "we tried democracy and it didn't work." The spreading of that attitude holds ominous implications for the future of Japanese democracy. Unfortunately SCAP must bear some share of the blame for this development.

This was certainly not the only conceivable type of constitution for Japan. In retrospect one can only wish that the Japanese, with advice and guidance of a more open and far less compulsive sort, had been permitted to work out their own constitution over a suitable period of time. Its institutions would doubtless have been far less glittering, and the measure of "democratic progress" obtained far more modest; but the probability is that it would have been basically acceptable in both respects. Beyond this, it could not help but have been better attuned to the people's political capabilities and, because of this, probably a more durable and workable system. At least it would have been demonstrably "made in Japan," thus freeing the United States of the numerous embarrassments flowing from its unfortunate involvement with this constitutional *accouchement forcé.*

A NOTE ON THE REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FOURTH REPUBLIC

ROY MACRIDIS
Washington University (Saint Louis)

Recent political developments in France, particularly the dissolution of the National Assembly and the subsequent elections of January 2, 1956, overshadowed one of the most interesting and long-awaited enactments of the second legislature of the Fourth Republic. A law of November 30, 1954, passed by the National Assembly by the required two-thirds majority, realized the revision of the constitution of the Fourth Republic. The law was the culmination of debates that had begun when the new constitution was framed.[1] One might indeed say that constitutional reform was advocated throughout the whole period of the Third Republic, and in 1945 the French people overwhelmingly expressed themselves in favor of a constituent assembly to frame a new republican constitution. Yet when the document was drafted and submitted to the people it was received with great apathy and endorsed on October 13, 1946, by a minority of the registered voters. No sooner had it been put into force than the movement for reform recommenced, and various leaders like DeGaulle, Reynaud, Mendès-France, Laniel and Bidault joined the eminent statesmen of the Third Republic in proclaiming the need for further revision.[2] Perhaps no better evidence testifies to the inherent instability of the French body politic than this perennial dissatisfaction with the basic instrument of government.

The constitutional revision of November 30, 1954, introduced in 1950,[3] provides a good insight into the manner in which basic decisions are made in France. The revision fails to incorporate the most needed of the reforms advocated,[4] and almost all the changes made bring France closer to the institutions of the Third Republic that the French people solemnly and overwhelmingly rejected. It is perhaps only an added note of irony that Mendès-France, generally acknowledged to be a political leader breathing reform and reconstruction in every one of his pronouncements, was the Prime Minister who put all the weight of his prestige in favor of the enacted revision when the final vote was taken in the National Assembly.

---

[1] For background material see Roy Pierce's "France Reopens the Constitutional Debate," this REVIEW, June, 1952; Jean Boivin-Champeaux, "Peut-On Reviser la Constitution?" *Revue des Deux Mondes*, April, 1952; George Berlia, "Le Projet de revision constitutionelle adoptè par l'Assemblè Nationale le 23 juillet, 1953," *Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique en France et à l'Etranger*, juillet-septembre, 1953, pp. 680–696. For a commentary which, however, deals at length with the procedure for amending the Constitution, see F. Goguel, *Revue Francaise de la Science Politique*, "La Revision Constitutionelle de 1954," juillet-septembre, 1955, pp. 485–502. Since writing this I have come across Roy Pierce's "Constitutional Revision in France," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 17, pp. 221–247 (May, 1955).

[2] The demand for reform became even more pronounced as time went on. In 1953, four Prime Ministers, Designated Reynaud, Mendès-France, Bidault, and Marie, failed to receive the requisite absolute majority after putting the question of constitutional reform and the need of legislation by decree at the forefront of their program. *Annèe Politique*, 1953, p. 42 and pp. 484–514.

[3] The projected revision, involving eleven articles, was formally agreed upon on November 14, 1950. On November 30, of the same year, the project was introduced in the National Assembly and received a favorable vote, 369 to 181. On January 26, 1951, the bill for constitutional reform with amendments cleared the Council of the Republic by 295 to 17 votes and was subsequently referred to the Committee on Universal Suffrage of the National Assembly. It remained there until July 23, 1953, when it was passed on first reading by the National Assembly by 468 to 127 votes. It then passed the Council of the Republic by 240 to 74 votes. After a number of postponements it reached the floor of the National Assembly again and passed on November 30, 1954.

The reforms advocated ever since the enactment of the constitution of the Fourth Republic were addressed to a wide variety of problems. For the sake of simplicity we may classify them in three main categories: (a) reforms aimed at buttressing the position of the democratic parties in the National Assembly by depriving the two extreme political groups of certain powers and privileges that were either real or had a nuisance value; (b) reforms of more basic character designed to strengthen the political and legislative leadership of the Cabinet and the Prime Minister and to promote Cabinet stability; and (c) reforms addressed to the improvement of the relations between the Council of the Republic and the National Assembly. The following articles were revised: 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 20, 22, 45, 49, 50, and 52.

1. REFORMS TO WEAKEN EXTREMIST GROUPS

These reforms were designed to strike at both extremes and more particularly the Communist Party. They modify provisions of the Fourth Republic's constitution framed at a time when collaboration with the Communist Party was a political reality and when the RPF or, for that matter, the Poujadist movement, had not yet been founded. Now that these groups, in a familiar pattern, seem ready to use the procedures of democracy to undermine democracy, some modest weapons have been added to the majority's arsenal. Article 7 empowering the National Assembly to declare war after prior consultation with the Council of the Republic, now provides also for the declaration of a state of siege "in accordance with the law." Article 11 is revised to strike out the requirement of proportional representation, which in the past gave an automatic representation to the Communist Party, in the election of the Secretariats of the two assemblies. Instead, the Bureau of each Chamber is to be elected in accordance with the standing rules of each body.[5] Article 12 formerly provided for one of the most important constitutional duties of the Bureau of the National Assembly by authorizing it to convene Parliament for an extraordinary session upon the request of the Prime Minister or upon the request of one-third of the members of the Assembly. As the article was revised, the calling of an extraordinary session is mandatory only if requested by the Prime Minister or a majority of the members of the National Assembly. In retrospect this revision may prove fortunate since the Communists and the Poujadists together have very close to one-third of the seats, and extraordinary sessions could have been forced upon the Cabinet. Thanks to this revision the Cabinet will be able to count upon brief periods of tranquillity.

---

[4] The literature on this subject is quite extensive. For background material, see particularly Lèon Blum, *La Reforme Gouvernmentale* (1919); R. Capitant, *Le Crise du Parlementarisme* (1934); Y. Haikal, *La Dissolution de la Chambre des Deputès* (1935). For the period since the adoption of the Constitution of the Fourth Republic, see: Jacques Meyer, "Constitution et Assemblèe," *Revue de la Defense Nationale*, dècembre, 1951; Boris Mirkine Guetzevitch, "La Revision Constitutionelle," *Revue Politique et Parlementaire*, dècembre, 1951. For one of the parliamentary debates, see: "Proposition de resolution tendant à decider la revision des articles 30, 45, 46, 51, 52 et Titre VI de la Constitution pour assurer la stabilitè ministerielle," *Journal Officiel de la Rèpublique Francaise—Documents Parlementaires—Assemblèe Nationale, Annexe No. 9048*, 3 août, 1954.

Along another line, article 22 is revised in a manner that limits the scope of the immunity of deputies from arrest or prosecution. They will no longer be protected during the period of their mandate, but only during sessions of the Parliament. When Parliament is not in session a deputy may now be prosecuted and arrested. Some guarantees are inserted, however. The arrested deputy can delegate his right to vote until the Parliament has pronounced itself on his immunity; and if Parliament does not make a decision within thirty days the deputy is automatically released. Finally, article 52 is revised so as to allow a Cabinet to stay in office during elections held in consequence of a dissolution of the National Assembly. The old article 52 provided for the replacement of the Prime Minister by the President of the National Assembly and of the Minister of the Interior by a person designated by him in accord with the Bureau of the National Assembly. It further provided that Ministers of State were to come from the various parliamentary groups not represented in the Cabinet. The new article will thus avert the participation of Communist and other extremist groups in the Cabinet during an electoral campaign unless they were already in it.

These revisions give the Assembly power to strike swiftly at the Communist Party and to protect itself against unwelcome harrassments from minority groups that have shown themselves in the past extremely adept in utilizing parliamentary maneuvers in order to undermine the Cabinet.[6] In most cases the reforms also bring the country closer to the institutions of the Third Republic. This is particularly true of the declaration of a state of siege, the limitation of the scope of parliamentary immunity, and the manner of election of the Bureaux.

---

[5] The Bureau of the National Assembly is composed of one President, six Vice-Presidents, fourteen Secretaries, and three questeurs. The functions of the secretaries and the questeurs are purely routine—the counting of votes, the supervision of physical arrangements, etc. The President, however, and the six Vice Presidents preside over the sessions of the Assembly. The new constitutional revision makes it possible to elect the whole Bureau by majority vote and thus exclude members of the two extreme political groups, provided, of course, that the center groups can agree among themselves on a slate.

[6] Immediately after the formation of the Laniel government in June, 1953, and the adjournment of the Parliament, Communists and Socialists demanded an extraordinary

2. REFORMS TO STRENGTHEN CABINET LEADERSHIP

Suggestions for strengthening Cabinet leadership and promoting Cabinet stability are as old as the Third Republic. At the risk of oversimplifying, they can be reduced to the following: (a) unqualified right of dissolution; (b) executive budget; (c) priority for government bills and more powers to the Cabinet to control the legislative business of the Parliament; (d) sharp limitations upon the financial and legislative powers of the upper house; and (e) responsibility of the Cabinet only to the lower house. It is a political handicap to these proposals that they are in the nature of a standing invitation to "cross the Channel"—an invitation that no French statesman can accept lightly.

The framers of the Constitution of the Fourth Republic instituted the last two of the advocated reforms by reducing the second Chamber to what was generally considered to be a state of political and legislative impotence. When the Council of the Republic was first convened in 1947, President Auriol told it, without any attempt at being humorous, "If the power of decision belongs to the National Assembly, yours is the power of prudence and wisdom." The only substantial right the Council had was to block or to amend legislation that came to it from the National Assembly by voting against it or amending it by an absolute majority vote, in which case the Assembly could override this vote only by an absolute majority. Given the lack of a cohesive majority in the Assembly and the conservative complexion of the Council, this power proved a stronger weapon then the framers of the Constitution anticipated. In some instances it was abused. On the other hand, article 48 disposed in the most unqualified terms of the matter of Cabinet responsibility. The Ministers "are not responsible before the Council of the Republic." The double political responsibility of the Cabinet under the Third Republic and particularly in the years between the two wars had aggravated Cabinet instability and had imposed upon the Prime Minister an impossible task.

The first three of the reforms advocated in the past, however—the right of dissolution, executive budget and cabinet control over legislative business—were not realized, so that the Constitution of the Fourth Republic in these respects reintroduced in essence the letter or the practice of the Third Republic. In fact two modifications were brought about, one dealing with the manner of designating a Prime Minister (article 45) and the other prohibiting delegation of legislative powers to the Cabinet (article 13), which weakened instead of strengthening Cabinet leadership. The first, by requiring an investiture vote to a Prime Minister by an absolute majority and requiring by implication a second vote of confidence on the Cabinet formed by him, made the choice of a Prime Minister and the formation of a Cabinet difficult, prolonged the duration of crises, and accentuated the conventional character of a Cabinet. In the first

---

session for the purpose of discussing some of the economic reforms promulgated by decree. *Annèe Politique,* 1953, p. 61 ff.

legislature, eight out of fifteen political leaders invited by the President of the Republic succeeded in forming a Cabinet that was acceptable to the National Assembly. In the second legislature, only seven out of twenty-four succeeded. Cabinet crises averaged ten days and in some instances lasted over three weeks. The constitutional prohibition of delegation of law-making power to the Cabinet, on the other hand, was ignored. The laws of 1948 and 1953 reintroduced, juridical subtlety to the contrary notwithstanding,[7] the old system of *decrets-lois;* and the ominous expression, *pleins pouvoirs*, or *pouvoirs speciaux*, gained wide currency once more. Almost every Prime Minister in the second legislature of the Fourth Republic asked for special powers or full powers, and many received them. Yet the controversy about the constitutionality of the procedure embarrassed many a government, brought the fall of others, and led to interminable debates that distracted attention from legislative programs.

It would have been natural, therefore, to expect a constitutional revision to be addressed to the realization of some of the reforms that had not been carried out. There was, in fact, a strong parliamentary movement spearheaded by Paul Reynaud arguing in favor of measures that were designed to strengthen Cabinet leadership. Speaking before the Assembly, Reynaud had urged that the right of dissolution should be given to the Prime Minister so that it could be used if a Cabinet was overthrown at any time within the first eighteen months of office.[8] Writing in 1948, he had also pointed out that

> . . . the instrument of structural and rapid reform (the *decret-loi*) was destroyed by those who were, after the liberation, persuaded to throw overboard the Constitution of 1875.[9]

Yet neither article 51 nor article 13 was included in the revision of November 30, 1954. The right of dissolution remains as hedged and qualified as ever, while the constitutional prohibition in article 13 against delegation of law-making powers to the Cabinet continues. Perhaps it was conceded that Reynaud's argument was no longer pressing, since constitutional practice had already done away with article 13.

Only a piecemeal attempt was made to strengthen the Cabinet. Article 9 is modified so as to re-establish the right of cloture in the National Assembly by the Prime Minister after the Assembly has sat for seven months. This right had been denied him by the Constitution of the Fourth Republic. Article 49 is modified so as to re-establish the old practice of endorsing a new Prime Minister and his Cabinet by a simple majority instead of requring a double vote of investiture—to the Prime Minister by absolute majority and subsequently to the Cabinet.[10] Finally, as noted earlier, in case of dissolution the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior are no longer required to be replaced by the President of the Assembly and by a person designated by him. Now they can remain in office to conduct the affairs of government and at the same time campaign, as Edgar Faure did in the last election. Even here, however, a compromise solution is reached, so that in case a Cabinet crisis results from a vote of censure, and dissolution and elections follow, the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior will have to be replaced.

---

[7] G. Gallichon, "Aspects de la Procedure Legislative en France," *Revue Francaise de Science Politique*, No. 4, 1954, pp. 795–809.

[8] *Annèe Politique*, 1953, pp. 484–490.

[9] *Revue de Paris*, "Juillet, 1948" août, 1948. The revision of articles 13 and 51 was also specifically contemplated by Mendès-France, Bidault, and Marie, who failed to receive the requisite investiture vote and by Laniel, who became Prime Minister in June, 1953.

It is doubtful that these measures, reviving the practice of the Third Republic, will accomplish much to strengthen the executive. They may facilitate the formation of a Cabinet and may strengthen the President of the Republic by giving him more freedom to select a Prime Minister.[11] But they leave intact the constitutional reasons for Cabinet instability. For instance, an adverse vote on the question of confidence will not count as a "crisis" in the constitutional sense of the word and give the Prime Minister the right of dissolution unless it is by absolute majority. The highly controversial and cumbersome article 51 specifying the conditions under which the right of dissolution can be exercised remains intact. Dissolution cannot take place in the first eighteen months of a Parliament, a provision that may prove very unfortunate in view of the present composition of the National Assembly, and not then unless there are two

---

[10] Article 45 (Simple Majority for Investiture):

Old Text	*New Text*
"2) (the President of the Council Designate) shall submit to the National Assembly the program and the policy of the Cabinet he intends to constitute."	"(the President of the Council Designate) shall choose the members of his Cabinet and submit the list to the National Assembly; he shall then appear before this body to obtain a vote of confidence on the program and the policy which he intends to pursue, except in case a force majeure shall prevent the National Assembly from meeting."
"3) The President of the Council and the Ministers may not be appointed until the President of the Council receives a vote of confidence from the National Assembly by public ballot and by an absolute majority of the Deputies, except in case a force majeure shall prevent the National Assembly from meeting."	"The vote shall be taken by public ballot and by a majority of the votes cast."
"4) The same procedure shall be followed during the term of the legislature in the event of a vacancy caused by death, resignation or any other circumstance, except in the case set forth in Article 52 below."	"The same procedure shall be followed during the term of the legislature in the event of a vacancy of the Presidency of the Council, except in the case set forth in Article 52."

[11] Yet, though the revised article was in force when the Mendès-France government fell in February, 1955, it took twenty days for a new Cabinet to be formed. Pinay, Pflimlin, and Pineau tried in vain before Edgar Faure succeeded. M. Goguel suspects that the effect of the revision will be to transform the abstention votes into votes against a Cabinet.

consecutive "crises" within a period of eighteen months. Efforts to delete the "absolute majority" requirement and replace it with a text according to which a "crisis" occurs whenever a government loses on a question of confidence or is censured by the Assembly met with stubborn resistance from the Communists, the Socialists, and the MRP.

It is equally interesting to note that article 17, allowing private members to initiate expenditures at all times except during the budget debates (which had prompted Reynaud to remark acidly that the deputies could commit follies eleven out of twelve months) has been left intact—thus destroying all hopes for the institutionalization of an "executive budget." Furthermore, no consideration was given to the possibility of limiting by constitutional amendment the many dilatory parliamentary devices that paralyze debate on the floor of the Assembly and place the Cabinet either on a footing of equality with private members or at the mercy of the National Assembly. For instance, the right of private members to initiate legislation remains unqualified, with the result that the legislative process is clogged with thousands of bills only a few of which become laws.[12] Government legislative business is hardly ever given priority, and the order of the day is decided in the Assembly by the Conference of the Presidents in a manner that attempts to balance the demands of individual members, parliamentary groups, committees, and the government. Even the decisions of this body, however, can be and are challenged and the order of the day modified frequently by the National Assembly. Above all, interpellations—the device that allows any member to take potshots at the Cabinet—continue to consume the time and energy of the Cabinet and the legislators. No way to restrain them has yet been found, and as long as the device is allowed free rein, the stability and the life of the Cabinet are in constant jeopardy. So it is legitimate to conclude that the most basic institutional factors that accounted for Cabinet instability remain intact.

3. REFORMS IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE TWO CHAMBERS

If the constitutional revision did not improve the position of the Cabinet, it dealt what may well prove to be a heavy blow at the most significant reform of the Constitution of the Fourth Republic, namely, the severe limitations imposed upon the Council of the Republic as a legislative body. This was the result of the revision of articles 14 and 20.[13] Article 14 had prohibited the Council

---

[12] See D. W. D. Lidderdale, *The Parliament of France*, 1951.

[13] The old and new texts of articles 14 and 20 follow:

Article 14 (*Introduction of Bills*)

Old Text	*New Text*
"2) Bills introduced by members of the National Assembly shall be filed with its Secretariat."	"Bills are filed with the Secretariat of the National Assembly or the Secretariat of the Council of the Republic. However, bills tending to authorize the ratification of the treaties provided for in Article 27, budgetary or financial bills and bills resulting

of the Republic from debating any bills presented by its members. Bills could be introduced but were to be transmitted automatically to the National Assembly without debate. Article 20 provided that the Council of the Republic should give its opinion "at the latest two months after a bill had been transmitted by the National Assembly" and imposed stringent time limits for budgetary bills and bills passed in the Assembly on an urgency motion. In both these cases the Council was required to decide within the same limit of time as that specified for the National Assembly by the standing orders of the Assembly. If amendments were introduced by the Council, they could be "rejected or accepted in whole or in part" by the National Assembly. If the amendments had been carried by an absolute majority vote in the Council,

---

	in the reduction of revenues or the creation of new expenditures must be filed with the Secretariat of the National Assembly."
"3) Bills introduced by members of the Council of the Republic shall be filed with its Secretariat and sent without debate to the Secretariat of the National Assembly. They shall not be admissible if they might result in the reduction of revenues or the creation of new expenditures."	"Bills introduced by members of Parliament are filed with the Secretariat of the Chamber to which the latter belong and sent, after adoption, to the other Chamber. Bills introduced by members of the Council of the Republic are not admissible if they might result in the reduction of revenues or the creation of new expenditures."

Article 20 (Powers of the Council of the Republic)

Old Text	*New Text*
"1) The Council of the Republic shall examine, in order to give its opinion thereon, the bills passed on first reading by the National Assembly."	"All bills shall be examined successively by both Chambers of Parliament, in view of securing the adoption of an identical text."
"2) It shall give its opinion not more than two months after receipt of each bill sent it by the National Assembly. When the Budget Law shall be under discussion, this period may be reduced, if need be, to the time taken by the National Assembly for its consideration and vote. When the National Assembly shall have adopted a rule for emergency procedure, the Council of the Republic shall give its opinion within the same period of time as that provided for debate in the National Assembly by the rule of that body. The time limits specified in the present Article shall be suspended during recesses of the session. They may be extended by a decision of the National Assembly."	"Unless it has examined the bill on first reading, the Council of the Republic shall pronounce itself not more than two months after receipt of the text adopted on first reading by the National Assembly. Each of the two Assemblies shall, if necessary, continue to examine the bill until an agreement has been reached. The text shall then be promulgated in accordance with the procedure set forth in Article 36. Should no agreement be reached within a period of one hundred days reckoning from the day on which the bill has been submitted by the National Assembly to the Council of the Republic for a second reading, the last text adopted by the National Assembly shall be considered to be definite and ready for promulgation."

(*Footnote continued on next page*)

they could not be rejected by the Assembly "in whole or in part" except by an absolute majority also.

Though the purpose of this article was to reduce the legislative powers of the upper house, it led to many awkward situations. Very often bills were passed in the National Assembly by the use of urgency motions and were transmitted to the Council of the Republic without allowing it adequate time to consider the measures. Also, the provision that the National Assembly could reject Council amendments "in whole or in part" was literally construed to mean that no wording could be changed or sentence redrafted. The Assembly actually rejected amendments "in part" (the rejection of an amendment "in whole" raised no difficulties) by deleting words without being empowered to add new ones, by cutting sections and sentences without being allowed to insert a new sentence, a new word, a period or comma. This created technical problems of draftsmanship to which even the elegance and flexibility of the French language could provide no answer. Finally, the constitutional prohibition against having bills introduced and debated on first reading in the Council of the Republic deprived the government of a time-saving device and clogged the legislative process beyond hope in the last months of the session, particularly in December when the budget is introduced and debated but hardly ever passed.

The new articles 14 and 20 introduce substantial modifications. Article 14 now permits the Cabinet and the members of the Council of the Republic to introduce bills in the Council and debate them there before they are forwarded to the National Assembly. Treaties, the budget, and bills involving a diminution of revenue or the creation of expenditure, however, must be introduced in the Assembly. Bills providing for increase of revenue, on the other hand, may

---

"3) Should the opinion of the Council of the Republic be in agreement with that of the National Assembly or should it not have been given within the time limits specified in the preceding paragraph, the law shall be promulgated in the text as voted by the National Assembly."

"4) Should the opinion of the Council of the Republic not be in agreement with that of the National Assembly, the latter body shall examine the bill on second reading. It shall dispose definitively and absolutely of the amendments proposed by the Council of the Republic, accepting or rejecting them in whole or in part. Should these amendments be totally or partially rejected, the second reading of the bill shall be voted upon by public ballot and by an absolute majority of the members of the National Assembly whenever the vote on the whole bill has been taken under the same conditions by the Council of the Republic."

"With regard to budgetary texts and financial laws, this period shall not exceed the time previously taken by the National Assembly for its consideration and vote."

"Should the National Assembly adopt a rule of urgent procedure, the time limit shall be double that provided for debate in the National Assembly by the rule of that body."

"5) The time limits set forth in the present Article shall be suspended during recesses. They may be extended by a decision of the National Assembly."

now be introduced before the Council. The new article 20 provides that in case bills and amendments emanating from one body are unacceptable to the other, they will be considered "successively" by the two Chambers in order to arrive at the adoption of an identical text. This reintroduces the famous *navette* of the Third Republic, a practice by which a bill was shuffled back and forth between the two Chambers until an agreement upon an identical text was reached. The same article gives to the Assembly the right in considering an amendment emanating from the Council of the Republic to modify it in any manner it wishes by rejecting parts of it, rewriting others, and inserting counter-proposals. This, it is hoped, will facilitate compromise and at the same time save the French language. The Council is required to examine a bill emanating from the National Assembly within a period of two months after the date it receives it, and in case of failure to do so the bill becomes law. For budgetary bills and bills passed by the National Assembly on an urgency motion, however, the time limits within which the Council must act are equal to the time devoted by the Assembly in the case of budgetary bills and twice as long in the case of bills passed upon an urgency motion.

In case no accord is reached between the two Chambers on an identical text within one hundred days, the National Assembly has the final word by deciding upon its own text or by incorporating any particular amendments of the Council of the Republic. The time limit of one hundred days counts from the moment a bill has been sent to the Council for second reading. In case no accord is reached on budgetary bills or bills passed on an urgency motion within one month and fifteen days, respectively, the National Assembly has the last word and may vote the definitive text. Finally, the time limits provided do not include parliamentary recesses.

It is quite clear that the revision of the two articles provides for a compromise solution between some of the more obvious shortcomings of articles 14 and 20 and the desire to maintain the superior position of the National Assembly. The *navette* is back again, but the National Assembly has the last word and can override the Council of the Republic, and as a result considerable time may be saved. Narrow time limits give to the National Assembly the power to decide definitively on budgetary and financial matters and to override the Council of the Republic. The urgency motion, if agreed upon by the National Assembly, is an additional club that can be used to arouse the Senators from their reflective mood. Finally, the Council of the Republic loses its strongest weapon—that of rejecting a bill by absolute majority and thus blocking legislation unless the National Assembly could muster a similar majority in order to override the senatorial veto.[14]

On the other hand, the Council of the Republic gains through the *navette* strong delaying powers[15] that may well prove to be, in the long run, formidable. Unless an agreement is reached, the Council of the Republic can hold up legislation for a hundred days. But this time limit does not include recesses, counts only after a bill has been forwarded to the Council of the Republic for second reading, and does not extend from one session to another. Since a session cannot, as a rule, be longer than 210 days while there are actually not more than 180 legislative days for the National Assembly, and since this latter body is not particularly known for its expedition in legislative matters, the delaying powers of the Council may indeed prove insurmountable.

---

[14] "The absolute majority rule, instead of being exceptional, has been frequently invoked: nearly a tenth of all the bills passed in the 1946–51 legislature were amended or rejected in the Council by an absolute majority." Philip Williams, *Politics in Post-War France*, p. 283. Some of these bills, the author adds rightly, were of "first-class importance."

The powers of the Council of the Republic are increased in many other respects. The Senators can now introduce bills and debate them; they are given the right, previously denied, to propose revenue increases; their committees have the right to examine these bills and in so doing to invite Ministers to give explanations and to answer questions. Is it not natural to expect that they will attempt to use these powers in order to regain lost prerogatives? They can do so in many ways. Given the lack of homogeneous majorities in the National Assembly, they can use their new powers in order to negotiate with the Cabinet. A Cabinet determined, on the other hand, to resist the Council may find its ever tenuous majority in the Assembly weakened. If so, is it not logical to expect that the Senators will demand as a condition of their cooperation more seats in the Cabinet upon which they have been casting longing glances?[16] The next step, though constitutionally prohibited, is equally unavoidable. Despite the fact that the Cabinet is constitutionally responsible only before the Assembly, is it not likely that opposition to any given government in the National Assembly may be strengthened, or its downfall assured, depending upon the attitude of the Council to its legislative program?

These questions are not purely speculative. They are supported by the evolution of the Council. Ever since 1948 this body has assumed a number of powers that the framers of the Constitution expressly desired to deny it. It forced the National Assembly to revise its standing orders and limit the use of the urgency procedure so that it might be given more time to deliberate on the bills forwarded to it; it participated actively in legislation that dealt with serious matters of policy and was able to force the hand of the Assembly on a number of issues. For instance, it prevented the liberalization of the colonial franchise; it modified a bill restoring collective bargaining, making it less favorable to the trade unions; it blocked the sliding-scale wage legislation proposed in 1950; it inserted new texts in the budget and suggested important modifications of financial policies; it introduced the system of "oral questions with answers" that resembles in all but name the *interpellations* used in the past by the Senate; it pressed for membership in the Cabinet and saw a growing number of its members participate in it. Slowly and not imperceptibly the Senators have been regaining not only their title but also the political prerogatives they had lost.

---

[15] Jacques Fauvet in *Le Monde*, December 1, 1954.

[16] The Cabinet of Guy Mollet, for example, includes the highest number of Senators—eight—of whom one is a Minister and the others are Secretaries of State.

These trends must be related to the political composition of the Council of the Republic. Ever since 1948 it has been more than the body of reflection—it has been a body of conservative opposition. Given the system by which the Senators are elected they overwhelmingly represent rural France. They represent, in other words, the interests of the farmer and of the powerful agricultural pressure groups that have been traditionally in favor of the status quo. The composition of the Council appears, in fact, to be today a political counterweight to the National Assembly. There are only 14 Communist Party members, 53 Socialists, and 21 members of the MRP out of a total of 320. Two-thirds of its membership is composed of Centrists, Moderates, Independents, and ex-Gaullists. It is doubtful that the Council of the Republic will have more patience with a Leftist Cabinet than the Senate had with Léon Blum. It is, on the contrary, very likely that it will use all its powers to attempt to bring about a Rightist orientation in the composition of the Cabinet. In fact, this is even more likely because a Cabinet will have to rely upon the Council in order to protect its legislative program against dissident groups in the Assembly.[17] The Council may oblige, but not without conditions; and its ability to impose conditions will be based upon the logic that contractual relations, so typical of French politics, imply—namely, the right to participate in the Cabinet[18] and to withdraw support if the conditions are not fulfilled. In this manner the ghost of the old Senate may yet return to taunt the framers of the Constitution of the Fourth Republic.

---

[17] For instance, the sliding wage scale was "blocked" by the Council in 1950, with the full knowledge and the cooperation of the Cabinet. In December, 1947, and in August, 1948, the Council restored to the form desired by the Cabinet two bills of major importance. Philip Williams, *Politics in Post-War France.*

[18] This was clearly illustrated in the case of the Bidault Cabinet which almost had its *loi de finance* defeated by an absolute majority at the hands of the Council. To avert the recurrence of the same situation, Bidault promptly invited the leader of the Radical Senators to join his Cabinet. *Ibid.*, p. 281.

THE STATE DELEGATIONS AND THE STRUCTURE OF PARTY VOTING IN THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DAVID B. TRUMAN
Columbia University

Recent controversies over the degree of responsibility displayed by American parties have underscored at least one feature of voting in the Congress. Whatever the merits of the contending interpretations and demands, the facts adduced on both sides suggest relatively fluid, unstructured voting patterns, especially in the House of Representatives. Although the party label is clearly the single most reliable indicator of congressional voting behavior,[1] it is admittedly somewhat less than perfect. The individual Representative may fairly often dissent from the views of most of his party colleagues, not only on matters of local or minor significance but also on issues of national or even global import.

The Representative's "independence" is most commonly, and in a good many instances accurately, ascribed to peculiarities of his constituency which generate demands for a non-conforming vote or, perhaps more frequently, are expected to be the source of recriminations and penalities if he does not display independence of his party colleagues on certain types of issues. But the Member of Congress is by no means always able to predict the electoral consequences of his choices even though he is sure that they may produce repercussions in his district. This unpredictability contributes to the unstructured character of his position. The political intelligence supplied by interest groups and individual petitioners and advisers, valuable though it may be in helping to resolve doubts, is neither so complete nor so accurate as to eliminate the uncertainties and risks associated with the Representative's response to a call for the "Yeas and Nays."

To the ambiguities of the cues the legislator receives from or perceives in his constituency may be added doubts concerning the preferences and intentions of the formal party leadership on any given vote. On those matters in which the leaders are genuinely interested, means are available for communicating the "party" position to the rank and file and even, after a fashion, for enforcing it. But on a number of votes the ordinary Representative, especially if he is a relatively junior member of the House, has no notion of how the party leaders want him to vote.[2] The reasons for this state of affairs may range from a prudent non-feasance to, rarely, a deliberate abdication by the leadership. The stable requirements of the party leader's role in the House may impose this occasional lack of guidance, or it may merely reflect the personality characteristics of the man occupying the role. But, whatever the precise causes, the fact of uncertainty on the part of the rank and file is unmistakable.

---

[1] Julius Turner, *Party and Constituency: Pressures on Congress* (Baltimore, 1951).

[2] These statements are based on a number of interviews with Members of Congress from both parties, conducted during March, 1956. They do not reflect a systematic sampling. Confidence in them rests rather upon the consistency with which these views were reported.

In the absence of well-defined, institutionalized, and continuously operative cue-giving mechanisms within the legislative party, one would anticipate that a variety of informal, only partly conscious, but not entirely haphazard devices would be employed by Representatives in arriving at their voting decisions. Moreover, within a body as large as the House or one of the parties in the House these substitute sources of voting-cues would be expected to grow up around familiar associations and relationships serving alternative functions. These would include personal friendships not necessarily political in character, relations of confidence developed through joint service on legislative committees, and even contacts created by the proximity of offices or residences in Washington. They would certainly include the almost ready-made relationships within the state party delegation.

Under certain fairly obvious conditions, voting agreement within the state party delegations is likely to be high. The issues in a given set of roll calls may be of particular importance to organized state-wide interests. They may be of special concern to more localized interests strategically associated with the party organization. Similar voting behavior within the delegation may reflect a tendency of the state party to elect members of Congress from districts roughly similar in socio-economic composition. If the legislative party splits into two opposing regional wings on certain kinds of issues, high intra-state agreement would accompany increased regional solidarity in the House. Finally, if the voting within the legislative party of the House approaches unanimity, it must also do so within most state delegations.

In addition, however, it seems likely that the delegation as a group affects the voting decisions of its members and, under appropriate circumstances, produces marked agreement among them. Some of the factors mentioned in the preceding paragraph, added to the intra-delegation relationships arising from joint concern with matters of legislative party organization or from purely social considerations, make it easy and natural for members of a delegation to consult one another on a variety of legislative questions. The delegation thus tends to constitute a communication structure whose repeated use results in a heightened consensus and similarity of voting among its members. In short, the state party delegation in the House may be a significant alternative cue-giving mechanism within the legislative party, especially on matters whose political implications are ambiguous. Uncertainty is misery and misery loves company.

I

An opportunity to examine the degree of voting agreement within the state party delegations and some of the conditions of such agreement in a single Congress occurred in connection with a larger study of party voting in the House and Senate in the Eighty-First Congress (1949–50).[3] The basic data are the number of agreements between pairs of Representatives within the two parties on selected roll calls of this Congress. The material suffers from the limitations inherent in a case study, but three features of the procedure somewhat reduce these by introducing elements of recurrence into the analysis. First, comparisons between the two parties are permitted, since they are analyzed independently. Second, limited comparisons in series are possible because the two sessions of the Eighty-First Congress are treated as units rather than jointly. Third, agreements can be compared at three levels of unity within each of the parties, since the roll calls were selected by ranking them according to the Rice Index of Cohesion and choosing them in sets in ascending order of cohesion. This technique produced for each party a set of relatively high and a set of relatively low cohesion votes in the second session and a single set of intermediate cohesiveness in the first session.[4]

---

[3] The study of party leadership in the Congress, of which this report is part, was made possible by a grant to Columbia University from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

There are 74 roll calls in the sets of each party in the first session and in each of the low-cohesion sets of the second. The high-cohesion sets of the second session include 66 Republican votes and 62 Democratic votes. All votes were considered for inclusion except those on private bills and those on which the party was unanimous (cohesion indexes of 100). The characteristics of the cohesion indexes of the selected sets are given in Table I.

In order to simplify the analysis, ten Republican delegations and thirteen Democratic delegations were selected, representing various regions of the country.[5] For each of the three sets of roll calls the number of agreements between each member of these state delegations and each other member of the same party in the House was computed and tallied by machine procedures, and

---

The author also gratefully acknowledges the help of a fellowship from the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, which released him from his usual academic duties during 1955–56, the generosity of the Watson Scientific Computing Laboratory of Columbia University and its able staff, an indispensable resource for the study, and the creative assistance of Elinor G. Truman.

[4] The number and size of the sets was dictated by the number of roll call votes with cohesion indexes of less than 100 in each of the sessions and by restrictions in the chosen procedure for IBM machine computation, which permitted analysis at one time of not more than and, for reasons of efficiency, not appreciably less than 74 votes. These procedures were adopted for the major purpose of a modified Rice-Beyle bloc analysis of the two party groups which would locate the formal party leadership in the voting structure and permit inferences concerning leadership roles. For the basic procedure see Stuart A. Rice, *Quantitative Methods in Politics* (New York, 1928), ch. 16, and Herman C. Beyle, *Identification and Analysis of Attribute-Cluster Blocs* (Chicago, 1931).

[5] The largest state party delegation was chosen from each of eight regions if it amounted to at least three men, and the second largest party delegation if it amounted to more than three. In addition, one extra Democratic delegation was selected from the South (Alabama) and one extra Republican delegation from the East North Central region (Wisconsin). The regions used were New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, West North Central, Border, South, Mountain, and Pacific. No Republican delegations qualified from the Border, South, and Mountain states. The states selected were, for the Republicans: Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, Oregon, and California; for the Democrats: Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Minnesota, Missouri, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Alabama, Texas, Colorado, and California.

TABLE I. DISTRIBUTION OF COHESION INDEXES ON SIX SELECTED SETS OF ROLL CALLS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 81ST CONGRESS

	Republican	Democratic
First Session		
Intermediate-Cohesion Set		
Number of Roll Calls	74	74
Range of Indexes	2.2–87.6	0.4–88.4
Mean of Indexes	51.01	47.6
Median of Indexes	57.05	47.45
Second Session		
High-Cohesion Set		
Number of Roll Calls	66	62
Range of Indexes	73.0–98.7	68.6–99.2
Mean of Indexes	88.5	86.5
Median of Indexes	87.95	89.3
Low-Cohesion Set		
Number of Roll Calls	74	74
Range of Indexes	2.3–73.0	0.0–67.4
Mean of Indexes	43.08	33.3
Median of Indexes	45.05	34.6

the resulting scores for each man were ranked in descending order.[6] So arranged, the data show, for example, that on the 74 votes of the first session Representative Bolling agreed with his Missouri colleague, Representative Karsten, on 70, while he agreed with Representative McCormack of Massachusetts on 57 and with Representative Grant of Alabama on only 38. In developing the bloc matrices for these sets of roll calls in the larger study, agreements on fewer than 50 per cent plus one of the votes were ignored. (That is, in the sets of 74 votes, fewer than 38 agreements were not tallied.) This was done in order to keep the analysis within reasonably manageable bounds and to maximize the clarity of the resulting structure. The effect of using the same convention here is to increase the significance of any positive findings. For example, this procedure would ignore the agreements of a New York City representative who spent so much time in Manhattan and was so indifferent about inserting in the *Record* an indication of how he would have voted that he was recorded as agreeing with no member of his party on as many as 38 of the 74 roll calls in the first session. Though he might have indicated his voting preference on 35 roll calls and agreed with seven other New Yorkers on all 35, he would have been treated as if he had not voted at all. Had it been feasible to include such votes in the analysis, the cohesion of such a state delegation would come out higher.

---

[6] "Agreements," as used here, include more than actual votes. Any declared position officially recorded in the permanent edition of the *Congressional Record* was included along with the "yeas and nays." Thus a Representative who voted "nay" on a roll call and one who was paired or announced against would be counted as in agreement on that vote. "Absences" thus cover all unrecorded preferences, including general pairs in which neither partner announces his position.

In order to arrive at a rough preliminary indication of the incidence of intra-state agreements and of the relative cohesiveness of the several delegations, it was necessary to determine how nearly the number of agreements within a state delegation approached the number theoretically possible if the group were perfectly cohesive. The first step was to list, for each member of each selected delegation, the number of scores, beginning with the highest, equal to one less than the number of legislators in the delegation. For instance, there were four men in the Democratic delegation from Minnesota, so the three highest scores of each were listed. Representative Wier's three highest agreements on the roll calls of the first session were with Representatives McCarthy of Minnesota, Blatnik of Minnesota, and Jacobs of Indiana. He thus had two intra-delegation scores among his top three. The same procedure was pursued for the other three men in the delegation, and the number of these intra-state scores in the delegation was then totaled for each of the three sets of roll calls. (In counting those from the state, two or more tie scores in the lowest position were counted as only one.) Since the number of scores with others in the same delegation for a perfectly cohesive group would be equal to the number in the delegation times one less than that number, the ratio of the actual number of scores to this theoretically possible number is not only an indicator of the frequency of intra-state agreements but also a rough measure of the group's cohesion.[7] Thus, referring again to the Minnesota Democrats, if the group were perfectly cohesive, the three top scores of each of the four men would be with his three state colleagues, a total of 12 scores. In the first session the actual total of such scores was three, or 25 per cent of the theoretically possible figure. These percentages for all thirteen of the Democratic delegations on the three sets of roll calls are listed in Table II.

Given the variety of factors which might affect the votes of a state party delegation, one would not expect to find perfect consistency in a set of results such as these. Yet a sufficiently stable pattern emerges from the data to provide a reasonably firm basis for speculation and cautious inference. Although there is a good deal of variation from one delegation to another, the ratios in Table II are high enough to give some support to the proposition that the state delegation is an element in the voting process. (It is well, of course, that these ratios fall considerably short of 100 per cent since, if the latter condition existed, it would almost certainly reflect a condition of party disintegration or chaos in

---

[7] The formula for the number of possible pairs of items in a group of N size, $N(N-1)/2$, cannot be used in this case because of the wide discrepancies possible between the top scores of two men in a delegation. For example, in a delegation of ten one would be interested in the first nine scores of each man in the group. If, on 74 votes, the top score of man A is with man B of the same delegation and they vote the same way on 45 of the roll calls and if man B's ninth score is 55, A will not appear among B's intra-state agreements, although B's name will appear on A's list.

TABLE II. RATIOS OF ACTUAL TO POSSIBLE AGREEMENT SCORES WITHIN SELECTED STATE DEMOCRATIC DELEGATIONS TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 81ST CONGRESS

State	First Session	Second Session	
	Intermediate Cohesion, 74 Roll Calls (%)	Low Cohesion, 74 Roll Calls (%)	High Cohesion, 62 Roll Calls (%)
Alabama	36.1	18.1	11.1
California	7.8	24.5	4.5
Colorado	33.3	33.3	16.7
Illinois	24.2	24.5	12.7
Massachusetts	6.7	6.7	3.3
Minnesota	25.0	0.0	0.0
Missouri	34.8	15.9	22.7
New York	10.7	26.1	10.9
North Carolina	7.6	7.3	10.0
Ohio	6.8	15.2	4.5
Oklahoma	23.2	37.5	1.8
Pennsylvania	11.0	26.7	15.2
Texas	30.0	26.6	13.5
13 states	18.0	23.1	11.5

the House and in the country, with each state's representatives functioning as ambassadors to, rather than officials of, a national government.)

More impressive than the incidence of these intra-state agreements, however, or the variations among the delegations, is the pattern indicated by the composite ratios in the bottom line of Table II.[8] These strongly suggest an inverse correlation between the degree of cohesion within the party and that within the state delegations. Again, examination of the figures for each of the state groups reveals that the pattern does not hold for all, yet for twelve of the thirteen delegations, North Carolina being the only exception, the ratios are highest in one of the two sets of votes characterized by relatively low party cohesion. (Note that the mean of the cohesion indexes of the "intermediate cohesion" votes—Table I, above—was nearer that of the low-cohesion set than that of the high-cohesion set.) And in eight of the thirteen delegations the intra-state agreements are highest in the set of votes with the lowest cohesion among the Democrats as a whole, the low-cohesion set of the second session. (The exceptions, in addition to North Carolina, are Alabama, Minnesota, Missouri, and Texas.)

Before attempting to analyze the circumstances of low party cohesion that might account for this pattern it is appropriate to examine the corresponding data for the Republican delegations, for if the same inference cannot be drawn from the votes of the other party, the pattern loses much of its interest and significance. Then one would be forced to conclude that the substance of the particular Democratic votes was responsible for the distribution. But if the pattern holds for both parties, one may legitimately look for more general explanatory factors.[9]

---

[8] These figures are based on the sum of the actual agreement scores in the thirteen delegations divided by the sum of the theoretically possible scores.

As the figures in Table III reveal, the general tendency noted in connection with the Democratic voting seems to apply equally to the selected Republican delegations. In nine of the ten cases, Oregon being the exception, intra-state agreements occur most frequently in one of two low-cohesion sets. In five of the ten, moreover, the highest intra-state score occurs on those votes on which the party is most sharply divided. (The exceptions, besides Oregon, are Illinois, Kansas, Michigan, and Pennsylvania. In some of these, especially the last, the difference between the first-session set and the low-cohesion set of the second session is slight.)

TABLE III. RATIOS OF ACTUAL TO POSSIBLE AGREEMENT SCORES WITHIN SELECTED STATE REPUBLICAN DELEGATIONS TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 81ST CONGRESS

State	First Session	Second Session	
	Intermediate Cohesion, 74 Roll Calls (%)	Low Cohesion, 74 Roll Calls (%)	High Cohesion, 66 Roll Calls (%)
California	15.4	25.0	12.1
Illinois	18.1	15.4	12.8
Iowa	21.4	46.4	1.8
Kansas	26.7	16.7	3.3
Massachusetts	28.6	33.9	12.5
Michigan	15.2	10.6	10.6
New York	7.9	18.9	10.3
Oregon	0.0	0.0	8.3
Pennsylvania	23.5	23.2	16.7
Wisconsin	14.3	23.2	3.6
Ten states	16.1	21.0	11.6

When the composite delegation ratios for both parties are arrayed against the

---

[9] In this connection it is important to bear in mind that the three sets of Democratic votes and the equivalent Republican ones are not identical, since the issues which divide the one party are not necessarily those which split the other. In the first session set 50 roll calls appear among the 74 votes of both parties. In the low-cohesion sets of the second session the overlap is 43 out of 74 and in the high-cohesion sets it is 29 out of 66 Republican and 62 Democratic votes. It is also true, of course, that, even if a vote appears in the equivalent set in both parties, it may occur at the upper end of the distribution in one and at the lower end in the other.

TABLE IV. REDUCED PARTY COHESION ACCENTUATES THE COHESION OF STATE DELEGATIONS: MEDIAN INDEXES OF COHESION AND COMPOSITE RATIOS OF ACTUAL TO POSSIBLE INTRA-DELEGATION AGREEMENT SCORES ON SIX SETS OF ROLL CALLS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 81ST CONGRESS

Party and Set	Median Index of Cohesion	Composite Ratios Democrats: 13 delegations Republicans: 10 delegations
Democrats, 81:2, low-cohesion set	34.6	23.1
Republicans, 81:2, low-cohesion set	45.05	21.0
Democrats, 81:1, intermediate set	47.45	18.0
Republicans, 81:1, intermediate set	57.05	16.1
Republicans, 81:2, high-cohesion set	87.95	11.6
Democrats, 81:2, high-cohesion set	89.3	11.5

median index of cohesion for each set of roll calls, as in Table IV, the strength and consistency of the general pattern appears with striking clarity. What this seems to reveal is that a property of lowered cohesion of the legislative party is not merely bi-polarization of the larger group but a fractionation of the party, or a tendency in that direction, out of which the state delegations emerge as one of the elements of residual significance. Clearly they are not the only such elements, nor would one expect them to be. The considerable variations among the states in Tables II and III suggest the influence of factors other than delegation ties. Moreover, the relatively low ratios, even for comparatively cohesive groups such as the Missouri Democrats or the Massachusetts Republicans, testify to the less-than-complete dominance of the state grouping. Yet, pending further analysis, the fact seems tentatively established that the issues which most sharply divide the legislative party in the House of Representatives do not set up comparable cleavages within the state delegations, with the result that the cohesiveness of the latter tends to rise as that of the party declines.

II

Despite the uniformities just noted, one would be incautious indeed, considering the crudity of these data, not to entertain the possibility that the differences revealed here may be due largely to chance factors. To introduce precise probability calculations into the analysis presents logical and statistical complexities of overwhelming difficulty, yet some further effort to examine these patterns of intra-delegation agreement, taking at least rough account of chance factors, seems imperative.

The simplest appropriate assumption to make is that, if relationships within the state delegations were of no significance, the incidence of intra-state agreements in any sample of scores, such as the number of scores equal to one less than the number of legislators in the delegation, should be no greater than the proportion of the delegation to the legislative party as a whole. Thus, in a

TABLE V. DISTRIBUTION OF INTRA-STATE AGREEMENT SCORES IN EXCESS OF EXPECTED INCIDENCE WITHIN THIRTEEN SELECTED DEMOCRATIC STATE DELEGATIONS TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 81ST CONGRESS

State	First Session			Second Session					
	Intermediate Cohesion, 74 Roll Calls			Low Cohesion, 74 Roll Calls			High Cohesion, 62 Roll Calls		
	Number in Delegation	Number with Excess Scores	Mean Excess Scores	Number in Delegation	Number with Excess Scores	Mean Excess Scores	Number in Delegation	Number with Excess Scores	Mean Excess Scores
Alabama	9	8	2.25	9	5	1.2	9	0	0.0
California	10	1	1.0	11	9	1.89	11	1	1.0
Colorado	3	0	0.0	3	0	0.0	3	0	0.0
Illinois	12	9	2.33	11	7	2.86	11	4	1.25
Massachusetts	6	0	0.0	6	0	0.0	6	0	0.0
Minnesota	4	1	1.0	4	0	0.0	4	0	0.0
Missouri	12	11	3.09	12	7	1.43	12	11	1.64
New York	23	10	2.0	24	19	2.89	24	12	1.92
North Carolina	12	3	1.3	11	1	3.0	11	4	1.25
Ohio	12	2	1.0	12	5	1.8	12	1	2.0
Oklahoma	8	4	1.5	8	6	2.3	8	0	0.0
Pennsylvania	15	8	1.5	15	13	2.08	15	10	1.7
Texas	20	17	4.6	19	14	2.8	19	11	2.5
13 States	146	74	2.65	145	86	2.33	145	54	1.83

legislative party of 100 and a state delegation of ten, it might be expected that on a purely chance basis one (actually .9) of the top nine scores of any member of the delegation would be an intra-state score. Any number of intra-state scores

TABLE VI. DISTRIBUTION OF INTRA-STATE AGREEMENT SCORES IN EXCESS OF EXPECTED INCIDENCE WITHIN TEN SELECTED REPUBLICAN STATE DELEGATIONS TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 81ST CONGRESS

State	First Session			Second Session					
	Intermediate Cohesion, 74 Roll Calls			Low Cohesion, 74 Roll Calls			High Cohesion, 66 Roll Calls		
	Number in Delegation	Number with Excess Scores	Mean Excess Scores	Number in Delegation	Number with Excess Scores	Mean Excess Scores	Number in Delegation	Number with Excess Scores	Mean Excess Scores
California	13	8	1.75	12	9	2.4	12	4	1.0
Illinois	14	11	1.91	13	7	2.0	13	6	1.5
Iowa	8	5	1.2	8	8	2.25	8	0	0.0
Kansas	6	3	1.0	6	1	1.0	6	0	0.0
Massachusetts	8	6	1.5	8	6	2.0	8	0	0.0
Michigan	12	5	1.6	12	4	1.5	12	4	1.0
New York	20	4	1.75	20	14	2.64	20	5	1.2
Oregon	4	0	0.0	4	0	0.0	4	0	0.0
Pennsylvania	17	12	2.58	18	12	3.08	18	11	1.5
Wisconsin	8	3	1.0	8	5	1.2	8	1	1.0
10 States	110	57	1.79	109	66	2.32	109	31	1.32

in excess of this, in this example two or more, could be regarded as reflecting the influence of intra-delegation relationships.

For each of the 256 legislators (254 in the second session) in each of the 23 delegations the top scores (equal to the number in the delegation less one) in each of the sets of roll calls were analyzed in this fashion. The results for each delegation were summarized so as to show the number in the delegation, the number having intra-state scores in excess of expectation, and the average number of such excess scores for those having them within the delegation. In order to develop the data as conservatively as possible, a single intra-state score was never treated as significant, no matter how small the delegation, so that the results understate the situation for delegations no larger than three or four.

In the low-cohesion Democratic votes of the second session, since the bloc matrix revealed, not unexpectedly, a very sharp North-South cleavage, the denominator in the proportion of the state delegation to the party as a whole was reduced. For the Southern delegations this proportion was based on the 137 Democrats from the South and the Border rather than on the 258 Democrats in the House.[10] For the Northern delegations and the two from the Border states it was based on the 158 Democrats from outside the eleven states of the South.[11] Although this procedure understates the degree of intra-delegation agreement on this set of Democratic votes, it reveals more accurately the special influence of intra-delegation relationships by discounting the effect produced by a delegation's voting solidly with one of two cohesive wings of the party. For example, if the calculations for the 24-man New York delegation had been based on all 258 Democrats, the number of intra-delegation scores that might have been attributed to chance would have been two rather than four. Twenty-one members, rather than 19, would have had more intra-state scores than expected on a chance basis, and the mean of the excess scores would have been 4.85 rather than 2.89 (Table V).

In general the results of this analysis support the conclusions already tentatively stated, as the data in Table V and Table VI indicate. As expected, the pattern is not completely consistent from state to state in either party. Moreover, neither the per cent of delegation members with excess state scores nor the composite means of the number of excess scores correlate as closely with the median cohesion indexes as do the ratios in Table IV. And among the Democrats (Table V) the composite mean of the excess scores is a little lower for low-cohesion votes in the second session than for the intermediate set of the first session, contrary to expectation, largely owing to the remarkably high means of two good-sized delegations, Missouri and Texas, on the latter votes.

Nevertheless, the basic pattern identified in the previous analysis also appears here. The proportion in the Democratic delegations with a significant number of intra-state scores is inversely related to the average party cohesion of the sets. (The per cents are 50.7, 59.3, and 37.2 for the first-session votes and low- and high-cohesion sets of the second session, respectively.) For twelve of the thirteen Democratic delegations, North Carolina again being the exception, the proportion with a significant number of intra-state scores is highest in one of the two sets of roll calls on which party cohesion was relatively low. For five of the twelve—Alabama, Illinois, Minnesota, Missouri, and Texas—this proportion is highest on the 74 votes of the first session. Other partial exceptions to the expected pattern appear in New York and Pennsylvania, where the number with more than the expected quota of intra-state scores is larger in the high-cohesion set of the second session than in the first session votes, although the means of the numbers of excess scores among New Yorkers are of the anticipated relative magnitudes. (The high mean in the last column of Table V for the Ohio delegation can be ignored, since it represents the scores of only one man.)

---

[10] Speaker Rayburn was omitted from all calculations because he so rarely exercised his right to vote.

[11] The delegations from the two Border states, Missouri and Oklahoma, were treated in this way after inspection indicated that on the whole both were somewhat more closely tied to the non-Southern legislators.

The data on the Republican delegations (Table VI) are even more clearly consistent with the expected pattern. The proportion of Representatives in these ten delegations with a significant number of intra-state scores is inversely related to the average party cohesion on the three sets, the per cents being 51.8, 60.6, and 28.4 for the first-session votes and for the low-cohesion and high-cohesion sets of the second session, respectively. And the same proposition holds for the means of the numbers of excess scores. In nine of the ten delegations the highest proportion of Representatives with a significant number of intra-state scores and the highest mean of the excess scores occur in one of the sets of votes with relatively low party cohesion, the only exception being Oregon, none of whose four-man delegation had a significant number of intra-state scores on any of the three sets of votes. In five of these nine delegations the highest proportion of significant intra-state scores occurs on the votes with the lowest average cohesion. The exceptions are Kansas, Michigan, Illinois, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania, and in all but the first two of these the means of the numbers of excess scores are highest in the low-cohesion set of the second session even though the number with such scores is no higher than on the first-session votes. Michigan is the outstanding exception to the pattern in this group of delegations, since the number of its members with excess intra-state scores is the same for both the low- and the high-cohesion sets of the second session, although the mean is somewhat higher in the former. The New York delegation also deviates somewhat from the norm in that more of its members had excess scores on the high-cohesion votes of the second session than on the roll calls of the first, although again the mean of the number of excess scores is somewhat higher in the latter instance.

III

With proper allowance for the limits imposed by the case of a single Congress, it seems clear that in both legislative parties in the House of Representatives the issues that divide the party as a whole do not split the state delegations in similar fashion. Rather they tend significantly to increase delegation cohesion. In other words, agreement within the state delegations is not simply a reflection of high party cohesion. Nor, among the Democrats, is it merely a consequence of solid delegation adherence to one of two unified wings of the party. Rather the intra-delegation relationships seem to have an independent connection with the voting choices of Representatives, particularly on those issues that divide the party most sharply.

The fact of the significance of intra-delegation relationships and their apparent connection with levels of party cohesion is little more than a political curiosity, however, unless an explanation of the pattern can be adduced or demonstrated. What is there about the diminished cohesion of the party or the issues leading to such cleavage that should bring this result? What relevance has it for understanding the nature of the legislative party in the House?

Reflection suggests that the issues which most sharply divide a party are of two broad types. First, there are those which are difficult, highly controversial questions, the Representative's vote on which seems certain to produce important consequences both for the interests with which he identifies and for his own survival in public life. Although these are thus freighted with significant effects, the certainty of the latter may be much clearer than their precise nature. The Representative thus confronted with a situation both insistent and ambiguous is likely to look about him both for guidance and for reassurance. Consultation with the members of his own state delegation may serve those purposes, perhaps partly because there is defensive value in legislators from the same area and party presenting a solid front on issues of high controversy.[12] On such issues, moreover, the formal leadership may offer little guidance because it prudently avoids becoming identified with either faction on a hot and closely contested issue, because it cannot, in the intensity of the conflict, hope to carry more than a small majority of the party with it, or because the leaders themselves are not in agreement on the issues. Such issues are not necessarily, if this speculation is sound, "local" in their impact, in the sense that the effects of rivers and harbors legislation, a general tariff revision, or an inclusive agricultural bill are local. They may rather be "national" issues of either high or low intensity locally, as seems to be the case with many questions of foreign policy. Although the distinction here is probably more in degree than in kind, there does seem to be a difference between the locally concentrated access of national interests and the access of purely parochial interests, though legislative voting patterns on the two may be identical.

---

[12] Among the many informal but continuing partisan and bi-partisan gatherings on Capitol Hill, many of which may be of far more consequence than their place in the literature would suggest, the ostensibly social but politically functional meetings of state and regional party delegations are common. (An interesting example is discussed in Tom Connally, *My Name is Tom Connally* (New York: Crowell, 1954), pp. 89–92. For a suggestive case of a somewhat different sort see Stephen K. Bailey and Howard D. Samuel, *Congress at Work* (New York: Henry Holt, 1952), pp. 125–26). Both Senators and Representatives testify to the value, on controversial measures likely to cause difficulty in election campaigns, especially primary elections, of solidarity in state party delegations. Unless deep personal or political differences intervene, two Senators from the same state and party may work out a common position on a set of votes about to be taken in the chamber. Much the same thing takes place, apparently, within the House delegations. On occasion such arrangements may bridge the wide gulf between the two wings of the Capitol and, of course, they may cross party lines as well.

Second, the votes characterized by low party cohesion may be expected to include a number of issues of trifling importance, "free" votes on which the party leadership makes no position known because the outcome is a matter of complete indifference to them. The Representative who rushes over from his office or committee room in answer to the bell announcing a roll call on such an issue may be completely ignorant of its substance and import. He may get a quick and decisive briefing from the first acquaintance he meets on his way though the lobby, from a friend on the committee handling the measure, or from a familiar source within his state party delegation. On such votes, therefore, it is less accurate to say that the party is divided than to characterize it as not being united because the matter of party is irrelevant. But the influence of intra-state relationships may nevertheless be high.[13]

Correspondingly one would infer that the state delegation normally plays a diminished role on votes of high party cohesion because there is no need for it to be influential. The issues in this type of situation are no longer controversial, are non-controversial—even if important in many instances—are trifling but unambiguous, or, if controversial, are by definition productive of cleavages between rather than within the parties. Some of the last would include those cases in which a unified leadership commits its reserves of influence, for whatever reason, in order to assure maximum support of a "party" position.

It is one thing to allege that votes of low and high party cohesion have these characteristics but another thing to demonstrate the point. Limitations of space prohibit the inclusion here of a list of all the roll calls, but examination of these six sets of votes indicates beyond much doubt that there are more issues of trifling importance among the low-cohesion votes of both parties than among the high-cohesion votes. For both parties roll calls such as those on authorizing daylight-saving time and changing the hours for the sale of liquor in the District of Columbia, on the omnibus rivers and harbors bill, on legislation for the benefit of limited groups of veterans, on efforts to rescind the curtailment of postal service, and on legislation authorizing library demonstrations in rural areas are much more characteristic of the low-cohesion sets than of either of the others. Minor issues, by any definition, are present in some measure on all the lists, but their distribution seems to accord with the expectation previously stated. "Important" issues of "national" consequence are also evident in all of the sets, but an assertion that they are more frequent on votes on which the party is unified can only be an inference from the more easily documented conclusion that minor matters are less common.

Since the six sets of roll calls by definition take into account intra-party controversy, there is need in characterizing the sets for some indicator of divergence within the House as a whole. Among several possibilities the simplest is the margin by which a motion is carried or lost as a per cent of the total number voting. This is not a completely satisfactory indicator, since "the House" is a constantly changing quantity. Thus a vote on a trivial matter settled by a close margin appears as a controversial item even though as few as 218 members bothered to vote on it at all. However, since failure to vote is often an act of avoidance as much as a reflection of indifference, refinement of the measure to take account of the number of non-voters does not seem readily practicable or entirely necessary.[14]

---

[13] For an illustration of this see Bailey and Samuel, *op. cit.*, p. 132.

Table VII shows the distribution of the votes in the several sets according to these margins. In both parties the concentration of the low-cohesion and the intermediate-cohesion votes toward the lower end of the distribution indicates

---

[14] The plurality margin in the House is a more satisfactory indicator of controversy within the House, however, than the incidence of "party votes," on which a majority of Democrats oppose a majority of Republicans. As the cluster of votes at the upper end of the distributions in the last two columns of Table VII suggests, the high-cohesion votes of both parties contain a disproportionate number of non-party votes, which testifies to the non-controversial character of many of these roll calls. When one party or both are badly split, however, the incidence of party votes need not be high, though it may be, since controversy within the House does not necessarily follow party lines. For instance, in the Democratic low-cohesion set of the second session there were 31 votes of the 74 on which the corresponding Republican cohesion indexes were relatively high. When these roll calls involved a coalition between the Republicans and the northern wing of the Democrats, who constituted a majority of the Democratic representatives, a non-party vote typically resulted. However, when the votes reflected a coalition between the Republicans and the southern wing of the Democrats, a minority of the party, the result was a party vote. Thus, though party votes slightly outnumber non-party among all the low cohesion votes of both parties, the difference—six percentage points—is not great.

One might further assume that if a considerable proportion of the high-cohesion roll calls concerns issues no longer controversial, among them there would be a concentration of votes on final passage and on the acceptance of conference reports—ratifying roll calls taken after the hotly contested phases of the legislation have passed and the final outcome is clear. Conversely, the low-cohesion votes would include a disproportionate number of votes on modifying amendments, dilatory motions, and the like—votes reflecting the unsettled, controversial character of the issues. Votes on recommittal motions might lie between, since they often provide the only opportunity in the House to register opposition to a measure but also may be merely ratifying actions.

Analysis of the roll calls classified in this fashion raises some interesting questions about the rôles of the two legislative parties but contributes little to determining the degrees of controversy within the House. The Democratic distribution fits the expected pattern, but the Republican reverses it. This suggests that the Democrats draw together on the ratifying type of motion because they are the responsible majority party, whereas the Republicans are more likely to be united on the preliminary skirmishes, splitting, when the ultimate result is clear, into a group opposed to the impending majority decision and one willing to go along with it. The latter choice is for them the "tough" one, on which colleagues in the state delegation may be influential, whereas the reverse tends to be true of the majority party. Whether this pattern is indeed a feature of the rôles of the majority and minority parties or whether, as the material in Duncan MacRae's forthcoming monograph, "Dimensions of Congressional Voting," suggests, it is a reflection of persistent ideological tendencies in the two parties, only analysis of a Congress in which the majority and minority positions were reversed could determine.

TABLE VII. DISTRIBUTION OF ROLL CALLS BY LEVELS OF COHESION AND BY PLURALITY MARGINS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 81ST CONGRESS

House Plurality (%)	First Session		Second Session			
	Intermediate Cohesion		Low Cohesion		High Cohesion	
	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic	Republican	Democratic
0.1– 9.9	8	14	10	17	9	2
10 –19.9	12	19	15	14	11	12
20 –29.9	9	8	16	8	5	13
30 –39.9	13	14	13	8	2	7
40 –49.9	8	7	10	17	9	3
50 –59.9	2	2	4	5	3	2
60 –69.9	6	4	1	1	1	1
70 –79.9	5	2	3	4	4	3
80 –89.9	8	4	2	0	5	7
90 –99.9	3	0	0	0	17	12
Total	74	74	74	74	66	62

that these issues tend to be controversial within the House as well as within the parties. The U-shaped distribution of the two high-cohesion sets, on the other hand, reflects the fact that these votes tend to be either non-controversial or are straight party-votes—controversial only between the parties—and therefore are marked by a high degree of discipline on both sides.

It thus seems reasonably clear that the issues on which the state party delegations are most conspicuous and, presumably, most influential—the low-cohesion votes—are of two kinds. Either they are the tough, politically ambiguous questions on which the Representative finds himself genuinely uncertain and subject to mutually exclusive claims—"cross-pressured"—or they are matters of trivial or purely local importance. On both types the familiar associations within the state delegation provide guidance, reassurance, and the defensive advantages of solidarity or near solidarity among partisans exposed to the same or closely related publics.

IV

The significance of the state delegation in the voting of members of the House has been established, at least tentatively, and an explanation of these relationships has been offered and partially verified. But one further problem must be dealt with. Although the term "state delegation" has been employed throughout this paper, the data in Tables II through VI, above, indicate that there must be a good deal of variation within as well as between delegations. Specifically, is it not possible that what appears to be a "state" phenomenon is only an artifact of a classification that ignores locality and other factors which may constitute a more substantial basis of cohesion than associations within the state delegations? Since none of the delegations in this study reaches or even approaches the theoretically possible—but highly improbable—perfect unity, some clustering of agreements within them is bound to exist. Examination of the scores within the delegations reveals, however, that such clustering is rarely to be accounted for primarily in locality terms.

Among the Democrats an outstanding exception is the Illinois delegation. Numbering eleven men in the second session, this group included nine men from Cook County (Chicago and its close suburbs), one from a district composed of seven "downstate" counties, including the city of Springfield, and one from a two-county district adjacent to the preceding and including the city of East St. Louis. As is evident from Figure 1, six of these men make up a cohesive and all but solid bloc on the low-cohesion roll calls of the second session. Among them these six account for all but three of the scores on which the per cent recorded in Table II is based, and all of them are from Cook County. Of the three

Member and District	District Numbers											
	2	3	4	6	8	11	9	1	7	21	25	
O'Hara, 2d		61	59	61	61	58					58	Cook County
Linehan, 3d			63	62	63	63						
Buckley, 4th		63		60*	60*	61						
O'Brien, 6th	61	62	60		62	64						
Gordon, 8th	61	63	60	62								
Chesney, 11th		63	61	64								
Yates, 9th					56						58	
Dawson, 1st	(No scores of 38 or higher)											
Sabath, 7th	(No scores of 38 or higher)											
Mack, 21st	(None of first 10 scores from Illinois)											
Price, 25th	(None of first 10 scores from Illinois)											

FIG. 1. Local Organization Control: Agreements within the Illinois Democratic Delegation,† on 74 Low-Cohesion Roll Calls, House of Representatives, 81st Congress, 2d Session.

† Counting only those intra-state scores included among the ten highest scores for each man. This figures should be read horizontally. Each row indicates those of the man's ten highest scores that are with others in the delegation.

* Only one of these scores counted in delegation total, as they were tied for 10th place on Buckley's list.

Cook County members not part of this bloc, Yates was a freshman Representative from a district containing a number of high-income residential areas, and Dawson and Sabath were unrecorded on too many of these votes to have any scores of the minimum frequency. What has been described as "Illinois" solidarity, therefore, is in fact a closely knit portion of the Chicago delegation, a conclusion not entirely unexpected, since this group is reputed to be one of the few delegations in the House over which the county leadership can and does exercise continuous and effective discipline.

A very slight degree of the same sort of localization is evident in the New York Democratic delegation, twenty of whose twenty-four members in the second session were from New York City districts. Although the pattern is much less clear than in Illinois, there are signs of some clustering along borough lines, especially within the nine-man delegation from Brooklyn, a tendency that is not astonishing in view of the coalition character of the city's Democratic politics. While these signs appear, however, it is also clear that the pattern of agreements spreads over not only the whole city but all those parts of the state represented by Democrats. There is a solidarity within the delegation that is largely independent of locality solidarity.

In a few other Democratic delegations there are symptoms of intra-state localism, but they are not sharply defined. In the Alabama group, for example, there is some evidence that Representatives from the northern end of the state

Member and District	District Numbers								
	1	2	7	8	6	3	9	10	
Smith, 1st		51							East
Davis, 2d	51			55					
Murray, 7th	44	48							
Byrnes, 8th		55							
Keefe, 6th	(No scores of 38 or higher)								
Withrow, 3d							53	53	West
Hull, 9th						53		51	
O'Konski, 10th		43				53	51		

FIG. 2. Geographic Factions: Agreements within the Wisconsin Republican Delegation,† on 74 Low-Cohesion Roll Calls, House of Representatives, 81st Congress, 2d Session.

† Counting only those intra-state scores included among the seven highest scores for each man. This figure should be read horizontally. Each row indicates those of the man's seven highest scores that were with others in the delegation.

tend to agree with one another more frequently than with their colleagues from the southern end, and *vice versa*. This, however, may reflect no more than a tendency for pairs of legislators from adjoining districts to vote together with a high degree of frequency, a tendency apparent in many delegations in both parties.

Among the ten Republican delegations the only instance showing marked signs of intra-delegation localism is Wisconsin (Figure 2). It is not a highly cohesive group, as a comparison of the scores in Figure 1 and Figure 2 will indicate. Nevertheless, a division between the western districts (3, 9, and 10) and those in the eastern half of the state (1, 2, 7, and 8) is apparent, though it is not absolute. This cluster seems to reflect a fairly complex combination of ecological and strictly political or factional influences. The western districts include large portions of the cut-over forest land of the state and most of the poorer farm land, and in general are less prosperous than the sections nearer Lake Michigan. In the western section lies much of the area once given to strong support of the LaFollettes, and here are two of the three counties in the state carried by Stevenson in 1952. The cleavage between the two areas also corresponds roughly to the boundary between the western Protestant, Scandinavian districts and the Catholic, German sections in and around Milwaukee.

Evidences of factionalism not so clearly based on geography also appear among the Texas Democrats (Figure 3). The districts of the highly cohesive ten-man cluster in the lower part of Figure 3, those of the looser seven-man grouping in the upper corner, and those of the three less readily classified men in the middle all are pretty well scattered over the state. (Figure 3 is based on the roll calls of the first session, since they involved the largest number of state scores.) The cleavage, whose precise implications need not be examined here, can be characterized as that between the loosely cohesive cluster generally willing to accept the moderate leadership of Rayburn and the larger fraction of the delegation, often inclined to repudiate his initiative and to cast in with the more "typical" Southerners in the House.[15]

Aside from the sorts of exceptions mentioned above, the great majority of the state delegations examined show no internal clustering on a locality basis and none based on obvious factional lines. These findings, even in the case of some of the exceptions illustrated here, lend support to the proposition that there is political reality to the intra-delegation relationships in the House. And a reasonable inference from the evidence is that in many such groupings there is a conscious effort at concerted voting. Some equally plausible inferences, however, may operate in combination with this one or even in place of it, although the last possibility seems improbable. An illustration is the California Democratic delegation, whose voting structure is built around four men, two from San Francisco (Havenner and Shelley), one from Los Angeles (King), and one from San Diego (McKinnon). It shows no locality cleavage, and it might re-

---

[15] Both these state studies and the inclusive bloc matrices underscore the lack of solidarity in the representation of the South, race issues apart, of which the Texas cleavage is illustrative.

Member and District	District Numbers																			
	1	2	3	9	10	14	15	18	19	8	16	5	6	7	11	12	13	20	17	21
Patman, 1st			59	54	57															
Combs, 2d	52		54																	
Beckworth, 3rd	59	54			58	54														
Thompson, 9th	54				58	58				55								52		
Thornberry, 10th	57		58	58		57														
Lyle, 14th	53		55	58	57					54										
Bentsen, 15th		51																		
Worley, 18th	43		44	45	47	45			46	43					48			41	43	41
Mahon, 19th			52	55	51	53						52			52	52		52	52	51
Thomas, 8th	(None of the first 19 scores with Texans)																			
Regan, 16th									46			53		49		52	50	48	49	49
Wilson, 5th											53			61		59	56	58	61	58
Teague, 6th												50				52	53	48	51	55
Pickett, 7th												61				60	55	53	58	57
Poage, 11th			46*	50	52	48		48	52			47	47	46*		51	46*	49		47
Lucas, 12th												59		60			57	58	56	58
Gossett, 13th												56	53	55		57		54	56	58
Kilday, 20th												58		53		58	54		56	
Burleson, 17th												61		58		56	56	56		56
Fisher, 21st												58	55	57		58	58	52	56	

FIG. 3. Non-Geographic Factionalism: Agreements Within the Texas Democratic Delegation† on 74 Roll Calls of Intermediate Cohesion, House of Representatives, 81st Congress, 1st Session.

† Counting only those intra-state scores included among the nineteen highest scores for each man. This figure should be read horizontally. Each row indicates those of the man's nineteen highest scores that were with others in the delegation.

* Only one of these three scores was counted in the delegation total, as they were tied for nineteenth place on Poage's list.

flect concerted action by the delegation. And yet there is a strong likelihood that the members of this nucleus were especially accessible to the legislative claims of organized labor. Supposing this to be the case, it might be argued that the statistical cohesiveness of the delegation is no more than a reflection of the accessibility of its individual members, as individuals, to the claims of the same national interest group. It is not necessary, that is, to conclude that intra-delegation consultation occurred at all, although the organizational functions of the state delegations in the legislative party and the political advantages of solidarity among neighboring legislators on issues of high controversy would support the view that both influences—interest-group demands and intra-delegation relationships—were operating simultaneously.

The California Democratic delegation also raises another question. Those top scores for each man which are not within the delegation typically are rather widely scattered, from New York to Washington. For example, the first ten scores of Representative Helen Gahagan Douglas on the low-cohesion votes of the second session included—in addition to four of her fellow Californians—Representatives Price of Illinois, Karsten and Sullivan of Missouri, Jackson of Washington, O'Sullivan of Nebraska, and Feighan of Ohio. Much the same pattern occurs in Pennsylvania, Illinois, and other Northern delegations. Since the increases in intra-state scores are most apparent on the issues that divide the party between North and South, may it not be possible that what appears as increased delegation unity is no more than a tendency for the representatives from the larger urban areas to vote the same way on this kind of issue? This does not seem to be the case in California. Comparing the low- and high-cohesion sets of the second session, while the proportion of "big city" scores is higher on the former by 12.9 percentage points, the proportion of intra-state scores is greater by 16.9 points. Moreover, the incidence of intra-state scores is greater by 13.8 percentage points in the low-cohesion set of the second session than in the votes of the first session, while that of the "big city" scores is slightly smaller, by 3.5 percentage points. Comparable results were found for other delegations, further strengthening the conclusion that the increased unity of the state delegations is not merely an artifact of the procedures employed in the analysis.[16]

V

Because the arguments and the evidence presented in this paper necessarily deal with tendencies and approximations in a legislative body of tremendous diversity and complexity, they should be summarized with a sharp eye on the dangers of overstatement. The basic position is that, unless one assumes that there is no pattern at all in the obviously rather fluid voting in the House, in the absence of institutionalized and fully operative cue-giving mechanisms within the legislative party proper, one would expect to find a variety of substitute devices performing this function. These would reflect associations within standing committees, friendships, and other structural features of the House. Among these the state party delegation, as a group within the legislative party, appears to have an important influence.[17] This statement is an inference from the evidence on intra-delegation agreements in voting. The delegation as a group of interacting legislators is strictly speaking an intervening variable in this interpretation; it is consistent with the evidence, but direct observation of its influence is normally not possible.[18]

---

[16] Since almost all Northern Democrats come from "urban" districts, devising a test of this sort presents difficulties. "Big city" districts are here defined as ones which 1) are in or contain a Standard Metropolitan Area *and* 2) are in or contain a city of 100,000 or more or 3) contain a county of 100,000 or more. The per cents on which the statements in the text are based are not identical with those in Table II, since all tie scores were included in this calculation, there being no defensible way of discriminating among out-of-state scores.

[17] In his forthcoming study, "Dimensions of Congressional Voting," an application of scaling technique to roll calls in the House in the 81st Congress, Duncan MacRae, Jr., presents evidence to much the same effect, particularly in his chapter entitled "Scale Positions and Constituency Characteristics."

The influence of the delegation is not completely consistent from state to state or from situation to situation. This was to be expected, since the delegation is not the only factor bearing upon the voting decision. At times the delegation's role is subordinate to or indistinguishable from centralized control by a strong local party organization, as in the case of the Illinois Democrats; from similarity of voting induced by similarities in the socio-economic composition of districts or by persistent factional cleavages within a state party, as among the Wisconsin Republicans and possibly the Texas Democrats; or from solidarity reflecting equal access to delegation members by the same national interest group, as the case of the California Democrats seems to suggest.

Such alternative influences as these are not inconsistent with a considerable measure of consultation and concerted action by the members of a delegation. Moreover, they do not seem fully to account for the persistent evidence of interaction and solidarity within most of the delegations. They do not adequately explain the occurrence of intra-delegation agreements in excess of what would be expected as a result of sharp regional cleavage within a party, such as the North-South split among the Democrats, or as a result of similarities in the constituencies of "big-city" Democrats.

A method of multiple correlation, if a suitable one could be devised, might not only assign weights to these varied influences but also might conceivably show that apart from these other factors—local party organizations, interest groups, similar constituencies, and the like—the relationships among the members of a delegation as a group were of no significance. In the absence of such a precise measure—and it is improbable that one can be developed—it is reasonable to infer that the face-to-face relationships within a delegation are an independent factor making for solidarity.[19] The evidence does not permit an estimate of the relative importance of the delegation as a group, and in some instances solidarity within a delegation can be accounted for on other grounds. But both the logic of the situation and the weight of the evidence seem to warrant assigning to the delegation as an interactive group an influence of its own upon the choices of its members.

---

[18] Occasional bits of direct evidence on delegation functions are encountered, in addition to those referred to earlier. For example, the twelve-man Missouri Democratic delegation in the 81st Congress, seven of whom were newcomers to the House in 1949, reportedly made a special effort at delegation solidarity as a way of supporting their fellow Missourian in the White House. This incidentally may account for some of the peculiarities in the Missouri data in Tables II and V.

[19] The peculiarly personal character of these agreements is suggested not only by the clustering within the delegations but also by the fact that the number of agreements within the delegations is unrelated to two fairly obvious formal factors, seniority and primary or general election pluralities. The data could not be presented within the limits of this paper, but analysis of the intra-state scores in these terms shows that freshman Representatives are no more likely to tie to others in the delegation than are those who have served for several terms and that occupants of "safe" seats are no more likely to behave in this way than are legislators from "close" districts.

Delegation influence is most apparent on the low-cohesion roll calls of both parties. Though the evidence is not completely satisfactory, these votes appear to contain a relatively large proportion of issues on which associations within a delegation— familiar through their use in connection with bids for committee assignments and a variety of other matters of legislative party organization—can be expected to function as a source of cues and of reassurance. These are the politically explosive but ambiguous issues of major importance, where solidarity at minimum offers defensive protection, and the genuinely trivial matters or those of largely local impact, where state colleagues, among others, are relied upon for advice. Presumably on both types of issues the leadership of the party as a whole does not or cannot supply guidance.

Though the functions of the delegation group are most apparent on the low-cohesion votes, this does not mean that the delegation is irrelevant even when the party is comparatively united. Intra-delegation agreements appear here in several cases more frequently than chance would explain. Reduced ambiguity and more effective operation of the party leadership on the high-cohesion votes would imply, however, a less prominent function for the state delegations on these matters.

Reflection on these findings points to a number of unanswered questions concerning the bearing of the general sociological literature about groups upon the legislative party in the Congress, and concerning the operation of the party group in the House and its role in the total political scheme. The legislative party is a system of mutually interdependent roles whose occupants share relevant attitudes and expectations, and thus satisfies the usual definition of a group. Yet it does not readily fit the specifications characteristic of the literature on groups. The character of the interdependencies and of the shared norms is not nearly so clear as in the case of the small groups from which most of the relevant sociological literature generalizes. Fluidity of internal structure, fractionation, and persistence all seem to be pertinent to a description of the legislative party. They are a paradoxical set of attributes because, given the first two, it is hard to account for the third.

This is not the place to attempt a thorough assault on this problem. It seems likely, however, that the incongruities emerge in part from two circumstances. First, the House and its parties are large, an elementary but fundamental fact that almost certainly has much to do with the peculiarities of structure in both. Second, and probably more important, they are an integral part of a more inclusive system in which variations and ambiguities in the distribution of risks and sanctions, from precinct to caucus to White House, have a bearing upon roles and upon the nature of structure and function. In the small, natural or contrived, "problem-solving" group of the experimental literature, in some larger associations such as militant labor unions, and presumably also in some highly disciplined state legislative bodies, the risks of the members and the sanctions to which they are subject are clear and integrated into the goals of the group. This is not the case with the legislative party in the House, but the persistent reality of party in the functioning of the chamber is unmistakable.

The generally accepted doctrines concerning leadership in formal groups assert that leaders display special attachment to the goals or norms of the group, and that their roles are functionally distinctive in that all members share a dependence on their performing in ways essential to the particular functions of the group. The application of these criteria to the legislative party as a system appears to extend little beyond the survival of the group as a scheduling device and as a means of allocating instrumental rewards such as committee assignments. Even these seem in many instances to be contingent upon the satisfaction of norms deriving from elsewhere in the political system, upon the reconciliation of the legislators' multiple group memberships. Yet the norms do seem at times to include more than procedural functions. When the competing demands of loyalties outside the legislative party are not dominant, the norms of the legislative party apparently can reach into areas of significant substantive policy. Apparently the leadership functions are then similarly extended, though perhaps permissively more often than as a positive role requirement, and they seem to retain a considerable element of contingency. Even under these circumstances there clearly are a number of significant substantive issues on which the leadership cannot or does not set a party line and on which relationships like those within the state delegations presumably tend to be determining.

More concretely, the present study raises a question of the extent, if any, to which leaders attempt to gear into the power that seems inherent in the intra-delegation relationships. These data can throw no light on this question, nor can they indicate whether the intra-delegation relationships reflect a power vacuum within the legislative party which a strong leadership might come to occupy, or merely an inevitable restriction upon the leadership role. To the extent that fractionation along delegation lines is a response to ambiguity in the House rather than to claims from the constituency—and some of the evidence here points in the former direction—further research may reveal a power vacuum. Further investigation may also indicate the conditions, such as the leverage provided by skilled and persistent policy initiatives from the White House, under which the role of the legislative party leader is broadened and the influence of relationships such as those within the state party delegations reduced. The broad theoretical questions and the more concrete descriptive ones raised by these observations may present a challenge worthy of further research effort.

STATE PATRONAGE IN A RURAL COUNTY*

FRANK J. SORAUF
Pennsylvania State University

The use of public employment for political patronage is an ancient phenomenon seldom studied by political scientists in systematic and objective detail. Texts and treatises on political parties reckon with the subject, but usually support their generalizations and conclusions with illustrations rather than comprehensive evidence.[1] Detailed studies date back to the muck-raking period, and deal chiefly with large metropolitan centers. The role of patronage in maintaining the thousands of rural and small city party units across the country, in the face of marked changes in the methods of national party operation over the past generation, is largely guesswork. Yet the vitality of these organizations is a matter of general concern for the future of the party system.

This study is an attempt to apply some of the more familiar assumptions about the value and role of patronage to actual experience in a rural county in central Pennsylvania where it can have little to do with policy control. Exactly what are the political uses of state patronage at this low level? Has it been used to reward the party faithful, or to encourage party activity and contributions, or to woo new partisans? In short, what does a small group of political jobholders contribute to the party that placed them in office—money? service? votes?

Very few states have so large a reservoir of political patronage, waiting to be tapped by the party in office, as Pennsylvania's. The state's partial civil service system covers only 20 per cent or so of its employees, chiefly those in the state police, the state liquor control commission, and those welfare agencies supported by federal government grants. The great majority of the state's administrative and clerical force in Harrisburg, as well as field employees in the highway, forestry, recreational, and institutional services, are politically

---

* I am especially indebted to Mr. Nelson P. Guild whose interviewing, observations, and criticisms were immensely valuable, and to the Council on Research of the Graduate School of the Pennsylvania State University for a grant with which to undertake this study.

[1] There have been very few full-length patronage studies, David Kurtzman's *Methods of Controlling Votes in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1935) being about the only one directly concerning the politics of patronage. H. O. Waldby's *The Patronage System in Oklahoma* (Norman, 1950) approaches patronage largely in terms of its implications for public administration and personnel policy. Patronage also is featured prominently in some of the broader works on parties as, for instance, Harold F. Gosnell, *Machine Politics: Chicago Model* (Chicago, 1937); Sonya Forthall, *Cogwheels of Democracy, A Study of the Precinct Captain* (New York, 1946); Frank R. Kent, *The Great Game of Politics* (New York, 1923); and V. O. Key, Jr., *Southern Politics* (New York, 1950) and *American State Politics: An Introduction* (New York, 1956). The subject is also considered in works on public administration and the civil service; Harvey C. Mansfield's paper on patronage at the national level in *The Federal Government Service*, a report of the American Assembly (New York, 1954) is a good illustration. The learned journals are generally barren of articles on the politics of patronage.

appointed. Generally speaking, while jobs in Harrisburg are more often reserved for gubernatorial largesse, the county chairmen of the governor's party maintain control of appointments to field jobs within their respective counties. Of these the highway jobs bulk largest in most counties.

In a state as heterogeneous and varied as Pennsylvania no single county among the 67 can be called typical. The site of this study, Centre county, represents perhaps the rural, forested, non-mining counties of the central and northern parts of the state. Located in the geographical center of the state, Centre county, with a population of 65,922, has only two boroughs with populations over 5,000: State College (17,227) and Bellefonte (5,651), the county seat. The county is predominantly agricultural, although the single most important "industry" may well be the Pennsylvania State University at State College.[2] The county has in the past 20 years been consistently in the Republican column in national, state, and local elections. The 1954 party registration figures testify to the county's tradition: Republican, 15,827; Democratic, 9,633.[3]

Although the patronage resources available in Centre county are not limited to the 140-odd highway jobs, these are the most important part of local spoils.[4] It is with these highway positions that this study is concerned. After the statewide Democratic victory in November of 1954 control of these positions fell from the hands of the Republicans (who had controlled them since 1938) to the Democrats, and the mass replacement of highway Republicans began. In the summer of 1955, eight months later, we interviewed the Republican appointees who were on the highway payrolls on November 1, 1954. Having been removed from their jobs by the summer of 1955, these men might be more willing to talk of their experiences as political appointees than those still working for the state.

Out of a total of 138 workers, we interviewed 123, or 89 per cent. The interviews were conducted in person and were preceded by a brief explanation of the purpose of the study. The questions were reduced to a few short, essential items; interested and articulate respondents were encouraged to talk on.

A word or two about the organization of the county highway crews may be helpful in interpreting the results of the study. The basic unit in the county highway force is a small work group, headed by a "caretaker" and manned by a small number of "laborers." To each group is assigned the maintenance of roads within a specific area in the county. Serving the needs of the county as a whole is a crew of equipment operators and skilled workers (painters, a materials tester, blacksmith, etc.) headed by a small number of foremen. The total sample of the 123 who were interviewed included: 17 caretakers, 67 laborers, 24 equipment operators, 6 skilled workers, 5 foremen, 3 janitors, and 1 typist.[5]

---

[2] The census figure of 17,227 residents in State College includes students living in town who account for a large part of the total. While the Pennsylvania State University is located at State College, it maintains the separate postal address of University Park.

[3] In the 1954 elections, however, the county did reflect the widespread swing to the Democrats that resulted in the victory of Governor George M. Leader. In Centre county the Republicans polled 9,442 votes to 9,164 for the Democrats. An occasional "county seat" Democrat also captures a county or local office.

[4] The county organizations are also able to place some patronage appointments in Harrisburg and within the county in positions with the forest and waters service, various state institutions within the county, and the state fish hatchery.

I

The first group of results clusters about the partisan attachment and activity of the highway workers. Whether the jobs are being used to pay past political debts or to recruit active partisans for the future, one might expect the appointees to be staunch party adherents. At the time of the interview 106 (86 per cent) were registered Republicans; the remaining 17 (14 per cent) were registered Democrats who had changed their registrations after the 1954 elections in the hope of remaining with the highway. Twenty more declared that they had at some time in the past been Democrats, so that only 70 per cent of the sample have been life-long Republicans. And at least 12 of those 20 sometime Democrats became Republicans earlier in order to get a highway job under a Republican administration. Furthermore, only 59 (48 per cent) of the group profess to vote at every election, 37 (30 per cent) claim they vote a straight Republican ticket, and 33 (27 per cent) say they discuss politics, if only occasionally. Judging by registration and voting records, then, these Republican jobholders would appear to be something less than loyal, vocal partisans. To the extent that the patronage was used to create a bloc of solidly Republican voters, it was only a very partial success.

Nor do the results of these interviews indicate that the 123 highway positions went primarily to reward past party activity or to bolster the party organization. Some 24 (20 per cent) reported having campaigned for the party before being placed on the highway; this campaigning took any number of forms (circulating nomination papers, canvassing for voters and votes, introducing candidates), but by far the most common activity was "hauling" voters to the polls. Similarly, only 7 (6 per cent) held a party office before going on the highway, and 10 (8 per cent) were candidates for public office before appointment. If one combines all three of these forms of political activity into one rough-and-ready index of political activity, only 30 (24 per cent) had rendered the party at least one type of service before appointment.

The Republicans were, however, more effective in using the jobs as leverage for extracting political activity *after* appointment. A total of 43 (35 per cent) campaigned while on the highway, 13 (11 per cent) held party office, and 17 (14 per cent) were candidates for public office. In toto, 49 (40 per cent) recorded at least one form of political activity after placement on the job. Combining activity both before and after appointment, 49 (40 per cent) campaigned, 13

[5] The Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent of the highway forces in the county were intentionally omitted from this study, since as supervisory employees they are in no way comparable to the large group of highway workers. They are frankly political appointments, and in addition to directing highway work they serve as "political supervisors" of the highway crews, collecting party contributions and screening many appointments.

(11 per cent) held party office, and 25 (20 per cent) ran for office. Finally, 59 (48 per cent) showed at least one form of activity for the party either before or during appointment, even if it amounted only to bringing an isolated voter to the polls 10 years ago.[6]

In one particular respect, however—financial contributions—the highway workers came in overwhelming numbers to the aid of their party. Of the 123, fully 97 (79 per cent) declared themselves party contributors while on the job, even if only once or twice; 19 (15 per cent) denied ever having contributed, and 7 (6 per cent) refused to answer the question. But the widespread hesitance to answer detailed questions in this area of low-grade party finance makes it hard to write with much confidence about their contributions. Not all of the 79 per cent who claim to have contributed did so at every election; about one-quarter of the "yes" group confessed giving only "occasionally," at "some elections," "a few times," or "once." The median contribution per highway worker, among those contributing at a given election, was probably less than five dollars; the political revenue per election totaled perhaps no more than a modest three or four hundred dollars.

Approaching these data on political activity negatively, 30 per cent of the appointees have not been consistently registered as Republicans, and a large portion of this group changed registrations either to land a job originally or to win Democratic favor after 1954. A large 70 per cent do not vote a straight Republican ticket, and 73 per cent do not discuss politics. Finally, 60 per cent have never campaigned for the party, 89 per cent have never held party office, and 80 per cent have never run for public office—either before or during their tenure on the highway. These data, then, would seem to indicate that the Republicans managed neither to reward a great deal of past party loyalty nor encourage future partisan efforts, either at the polls or within the party apparatus.

In several respects, though, the party has shown a determination to earn dividends on its political investments. First of all, the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of the highway office in the county did carefully solicit the workers for political contributions during working hours. The feeling was widespread that at least a token contribution was the course of prudence. A puzzling minority claim they were never asked to contribute; it seems likely in these cases that a contribution was assumed or tacitly expected. But although the solicitations were apparently made systematically, there is no reason to think that the Republicans dismissed highway employees for failure to contribute or to contribute with suitable generosity. Secondly, in addition to the careful cultivation of contributions, party chairmen in some parts of the county have dispatched caretakers and equipment operators on election day to bring distant voters to the polls. A number of the workers apologized for this campaigning and explained it was not voluntary.

---

[6] The figures add to a total greater than 100% because some workers campaigned both before and during their employment on the highway. The same reason applies to the data on party office holding and on candidacies.

The relationship between partisan activity and political jobholding varies considerably among the several job categories on the highway. In general, the better-paid caretakers were considerably more partisan and politically active than the laborers (see Table I). They were more frequently life-long Republicans, they voted more consistently and more consistently Republican, and they discussed politics far more frequently than the other highway workers. In addition, they were more active by far in party affairs and councils, accounting by themselves for over half of all those who have held party office. They were also the most regular and the most generous contributors to the party treasury. The vastly greater partisan involvement of these 17 caretakers suggests that there exists in Centre county a genuine patronage system within the entire patronage system—that perhaps for the real functions of reward and stimulus a smaller number of more desirable jobs has sufficed.

TABLE I—POLITICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF WORKERS (BY OCCUPATION)

	Total Group (123)	Caretakers (17)	Equipment Operators (24)	Laborers (67)	All but Caretakers (106)
Registration					
Republican at interview	86%	100%	88%	81%	84%
Republican all of life	70	94	63	66	66
Political interest and loyalty					
vote at every election	48	76	33	45	43
vote straight ticket	30	59	17	31	25
discuss politics	20	76	8	21	19
Political activity (before and after appointment)					
campaigned	40	88	29	33	32
held party office	11	47	0	3	5
ran for public office	20	59	8	19	14
any one type of activity	48	94	33	45	42
Political contributions					
contributed at least once	79	100	79	72	75
median contribution	$5	$15	$10	$2–3	$4

Revealing, too, of the uses of patronage in Centre county is the process by which these highway positions are filled. Fully 38 (31 per cent) of the 123 workers interviewed claim not to have sought the job they held, but rather were asked to take it by a party official, caretaker, or superintendent.[7] For the other 69 per cent who admit having actively pursued a job on the highway, there seems to have been no one procedure to follow, no royal road to employment. The largest number (31 per cent) began by approaching a local party official, but 26 per cent went to the county highway superintendent and 19 per cent to the local caretaker. A majority of the job-seekers landed a political job with only one sponsor, or without having seen the local party functionary. As a matter of fact, 51 (41 per cent) of all the 123 jobholders do not recall having seen any party official during the process of being placed on the highway rolls; the local committeeman probably had nonetheless approved the application without seeing the applicant. Recollections about an event that for some of the interviewees happened over 20 years ago may have faded, and ought therefore to be interpreted with reserve; it seems unlikely, though, that the information should be totally disregarded.

---

[7] These jobs, as one might expect, were the least desirable ones; 26 of the 38 were laborers.

The total effect of such an uncertain placement process is not easy to assess. In some cases, especially those involving laborers, the local party must act as a recruitment agency in order simply to keep the highway crews fully manned. When, as in these instances, the party has to seek takers for its jobs, the patronage system is clearly serving no political purpose. In other cases the party dispenses the patronage, but in a haphazard way that may defeat its own purpose—by allowing personal friendships rather than partisan merit to influence the decisions, by permitting the highway worker to forget that he has a political job and that he works because of Republican (or Democratic) beneficence, and by tolerating the recruitment of workers solely on the basis of ability in a crude and informal merit system.

Something of this unclear image and imperfect use of patronage opportunities may be illustrated in another way. We asked each subject why he thought that he in particular was given his political job. Seventy-one (58 per cent) begged the intent of the question by answering something in the nature of "there was a vacancy" or "the highway needed a man"; some of this group, however, mentioned additional reasons. But only 15 (12 per cent) of the whole group cited their Republicanism, and 16 (13 per cent) referred to political influence or "pull." Another 20 (16 per cent) knew a worker on the highway crew, 9 (7 per cent) needed a job, 6 (5 per cent) claimed they were known as good or qualified workers, 2 (2 per cent) had had other patronage jobs, and 19 (15 per cent) expressed no opinion. Apparently many of the jobholders either took for granted or forgot the political control over the highway positions. At least, most men thought non-political considerations entered into their success in getting a job. Their feelings were perhaps summed up by the worker who remarked: "When I found out what a political job it was, I sometimes wondered how I got it."

Since the incompatibility of patronage and a merit system rests at bottom on the use of political "worthiness" as the standard of merit in patronage, the result of this study that perhaps most fundamentally challenges the premises of the patronage system was the revelation that many of the jobs did not change hands after the Republican defeat in 1954. Of the 123 workers interviewed, 38 (31 per cent) were still on the job at the time of the interview in summer of 1955. And 34 (28 per cent) were still on the highway one year later

(November, 1955) on the very eve of the local elections in Centre county, when one might reasonably have expected the Democrats to be marshalling all available resources for an assault on the county court house. One must conclude, then, that the Democrats, denied state patronage in Pennsylvania since 1938, were not able to use the available jobs for political rewards, unless they hoped to "purchase" votes from apostate Republicans whom they permitted to continue on the job.

A brief analysis of the 34 workers able to survive the sudden death of political change suggests some reasons why the turnover in personnel was incomplete. The survivors, when compared with the total group, exhibit less partisan loyalty and a shorter record of political activity: less straight ticket voting, fewer political discussions, more registration changes, and less political activity of any form. In addition to the generally lower level of political allegiance among the holdovers, a second point of note concerning them is the extraordinary hardiness of the skilled workers: the equipment operators, the foremen, and the various skilled employees. The strongly partisan caretakers, by contrast, were virtually wiped out, and the percentage of laborers declined noticeably.

Doubtless the survival of the more skilled employees illustrates the extent to which an informal merit system has infiltrated the ranks of patronage. The skills and experience required for these jobs are evidently too rare and too important, in an era of full employment, to be disregarded for political purposes. The data amply illustrate the relative importance of political considerations as against those of skill and experience. The almost total absence of the "politicking" caretakers from the holdover group, and the consequent overweighting of the "apolitical" skilled men, influences the total level of political activity among the holdovers. If, however, one makes comparisons within occupational groups, setting holdover laborers and equipment operators against the total number of laborers and operators, an interesting fact emerges. The holdovers among the unskilled laborers are less political than the total group of laborers, but the holdovers among the skilled equipment operators are actually more political. It appears, then, that the skills which equipment operators possess are an asset which more than outweighs the liability of Republican activity and partisanship. The comparisons also indicate that far more laborers than operators changed their registration after November, 1954, some to curry Democratic favor and others, at Democratic behest, to make their retention appear politically respectable.

In addition, we asked each of the 34 holdovers to speculate on the reasons for his success in keeping the job. Their reasons again suggest the diverse ways of patronage. Their success, they thought, was due to: irreplaceable skills or experience (18), influential Democratic friends (6), change in registration (5), reputation as a good worker (4), influence of caretaker (4), personal need (3), political inactivity (2), and "don't know" (6).[8] These self-analyses tend to support the conclusions already given. The Democrats were forced to reappoint skilled and experienced men, albeit Republicans; these account for one part of the holdover group. The other portion of the holdovers were generally politically inactive or less loyal Republicans, or those who had friends among Democratic leaders and caretakers. They could be reappointed without subjecting the Democrats to the embarrassment of retaining vocal or aggressive Republicans.

---

[8] Some of the respondents gave more than one reason for their retention.

The irony here is that if the highway workers should realize that those with the loosest party ties can best survive a change of parties, they will defeat the primary purpose of patronage. A number of the interviewees made it abundantly clear that they were well apprised of this possibility. Several observed that after the Democratic victory in 1954 the first workers replaced were the active party men who "stuck their bills out." Furthermore, any party that fails to effect a complete and ruthless change of workers threatens the effectiveness of the entire system of patronage by encouraging the workers to hedge against an eventual change of parties in the state.

In an undisguised attempt to discover the effectiveness of patronage in luring voters to the dispensing party's banner, the 123 workers were asked whether they felt they "owed" their vote to the Republican party. A surprisingly large group of 55 (45 per cent) replied "yes"; 66 (54 per cent) said "no," and the remainder had no opinion. However, only 20 of those 55 who replied "yes" also reported voting a straight ticket, a fact which would cast some uncertainty on the avowals of obligation. Furthermore, of these 20 straight ticket voters who also felt an obligation to vote for the party, 11 recorded past party activity that might indicate a pre-existing party loyalty. Remaining, then, are 9 straight ticket voters who confess "owing" their vote and yet who have no other record of party activity.

Testing claims of obligation against actual performance in terms of straight ticket voting, one may doubt the efficacy of a political job to attract a solid vote for the party. It may, of course, create a voting tendency or "leaning"—an "all other things being equal" loyalty—that is not intense enough to create straight ticket voting. The data serve also to point out that a number of those professing obligation were probably fairly well committed to Republicanism on other grounds. One may, therefore, wonder whether the highway worker will even deliver his own vote, much less those of his friends and neighbors. Time and again, workers professing no obligation added remarks to the general effect that "I earned every cent I got; I didn't owe them a thing."

Finally, to get something of a worker's eye view of the patronage system, each worker was asked whether he favored putting the highway jobs on a civil service system, whereby the worker, if qualified, would retain his job regardless of election results. The answers were overwhelmingly in favor of civil service; 99 (80 per cent) favored it, 13 (11 per cent) were opposed, and the remainder had no opinion. However, of the 99 "yes" respondents, 39 expressed a reservation that would in some manner limit it to the lower patronage ranks; most frequently their intention was to exclude the county superintendent and his assistant. Many patronage holders apparently believe that some political jobs are more political than others.

The wide acceptance of civil service may be a normal reaction on the part of men who are now on the outside looking in. Yet 27 (79 per cent) of the 34 men who were still on the job also favored the introduction of civil service. Patronage by its nature fosters an insecurity and consequent opposition within its own ranks; to this extent it carries within itself the seeds of its own opposition. And this pent-up insecurity and hostility may break loose when the worker loses his job—his anger may cancel whatever gratitude he earlier had, or he may experience a complete disenchantment with parties and politics. Workers repeatedly commented that "politics ought not to hurt the working man." To deprive a man of his livelihood for no other reason than the victory of a gubernatorial candidate strikes many of them as unjust, if not immoral. Especially when the worker can see that appointments are made for other than political reasons, he feels that removal for political reasons alone represents a sort of "dirty pool," a game with different rules for each side.

That this loss of a job is a serious matter to these men is borne out by the fact that of those interviewed in the summer, 37 (30 per cent) were unemployed.[9] For a man of 50 or 60, who has spent most of his adult years on the highway, unemployment is a personal tragedy that will inevitably produce bitterness. This insecurity may also account for the fact that of the 85 who had been replaced by interview time only 40 indicated a clear willingness to get the job back sometime in the future; 25 said they were not interested, and 16 said "yes" with reservations.[10]

One final point is relevant to Schattschneider's hypothesis that "the patronage fields will yield their most abundant fruit if plowed and replowed often, for gratitude is a perishable commodity."[11] Half of the 123 men had 9 years or more of service (either continuous or interrupted) on the highway, and 39 (32 percent) men had totals of 14 or more years. In Centre county, at least, the fields of patronage have been allowed to lie fallow, or at best to reseed themselves. Some resulting spoilage of gratitude may account for the loss of vitality in the system.

II

This study reflects one small view of patronage in one political milieu. Its limitations are readily apparent—the reliance on the memory and veracity of the interviewee, the small scale of the study, and the possibility that the microcosm of Centre county may not be widely representative. Moreover, this research dealt with unattractive, poorly-paid maintenance jobs. The conclusions that have preceded and those that will follow must be evaluated with these caveats in mind.

---

[9] Some had been removed only a week or so before we interviewed them; others had been out of work for five or six months.

[10] Reservations were of these types: they would return if the jobs were covered by social security, if the pay were better, if the work were steadier, if they could return soon, or if they wouldn't have to force another man out of his job.

[11] E. E. Schattschneider, *Party Government* (New York, 1942), p. 103.

The data, first of all, suggest that there are many levels of patronage with varying degrees of political effectiveness. Even within the narrow range of this study, two patronage systems emerge—the more effective system of appointments to the caretakers' positions and the appointments to other jobs. In the better-paid caretaker jobs the party secured markedly greater political activity, rewarded more loyal partisans, and extracted greater party effort. But in the less attractive highway jobs, political activity and interest fell off sharply, merely proving that as the desirability of the job decreases, its value as political currency decreases. One may wonder, then, whether patronage must extend so far down the scale of public employment in order to achieve its political purposes.

It is precisely this dubious value of, say, an unskilled laboring job that imposes the first limitation on the effective use of patronage. Demand for the jobs is often so feeble that the party must solicit workers for the jobs, or at best dispense them haphazardly. The significant political leadership in the county will generally be uninterested in such employment.

At the same time, the parties are restricted in their exploitation of these jobs by the need to maintain a reasonably effective highway crew. Appointees of the previous administration may have to be retained, especially if their skills are irreplaceable, and new workers will often be recruited as much on merit considerations as on those of political worthiness. There exists, then, an informal merit system where initial appointment and even survival on the job depends often on skills and experience.

Thirdly, the unclear and even hostile attitude of the 123 jobholders toward the patronage system sharply limits its effectiveness. The workers lacked a clear impression that theirs were political jobs, bestowed for political reasons; and if they did realize it, they rarely seemed reconciled to the fact. Their sentiments on "owing" votes to the party and on civil service reform indicate an unwillingness to play according to the ground rules of the patronage game. Many, furthermore, struck at the political roots of patronage by underplaying their political activity in order to hedge against the omnipresent possibility of a change of parties. One suspects also that politicians themselves hesitate in a small, tightly-knit community to engage in the ruthless hiring and firing that patronage demands.

Under these circumstances it certainly is not amazing that the political uses of these highway jobs have been haphazard and partial. The surprising disclosure, perhaps, is not that three-fourths of the workers were politically inactive before appointment, but that one-fourth were active. However, the data do create doubt that such low-level patronage can serve any great political role in the face of such limits to its effectiveness. In view of the workers' high degree of political inactivity, it becomes clear that the highway jobs were often neither rewarding past political activity nor encouraging it in the future. Furthermore, the degree of registration changing and split-ticket voting indicates that in most cases the jobs did not go even to loyal and vocal Republican partisans.

In this one county, then, patronage accomplishes a number of purposes. It serves a limited function as a political reward and stimulus, particularly in the more desirable caretaker positions. It serves also as an *ad hoc* merit system, whereby skilled and experienced men are recruited by superintendents and caretakers and then given even a semblance of tenure regardless of political changes. At another level the party simply runs an employment and recruitment agency, staffing the highway crews and trying to keep them at full strength. Finally, patronage may gratify the egos of local party functionaries and supervisory highway employees by permitting them to dispense political largesse to friends and acquaintances in the community. What political strength the local party does gain from its appointments may, therefore, be partially offset by the need to attend to the non-political uses of patronage.

EMERGING CONFLICTS IN THE DOCTRINES OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*

HERBERT KAUFMAN

Yale University

As a self-conscious discipline among the cluster of specialties or "fields" encompassed by political science, public administration came late and grew fast.[1] Its recent arrival and rapid growth sometimes obscure the fact that its origins are to be found in a process of experimentation with governmental structure that long preceded the appearance of public administration as a subject of systematic study and is likely to continue as long as the nation exists. This process of experimentation goes on vigorously today, and the development of new forms is generating discord more profound and far-reaching than any that has ever hitherto divided students of public administration. It is with the sources and significance of that discord that this paper is concerned.

I. THREE CORE VALUES

The central thesis of this paper is that an examination of the administrative institutions of this country suggests that they have been organized and operated in pursuit successively of three values, here designated representativeness, neutral competence, and executive leadership. Each of these values has been dominant (but not to the point of total suppression of the others) in different periods of our history; the shift from one to another generally appears to have occurred as a consequence of the difficulties encountered in the period preceding the change.[2] Much of the early literature commonly identified as within the province of public administration was written during the transition from the first to the second of these values, and the great flood of materials produced after World War I often reflected both the second and third values when these for a time (and for reasons to be explained) pointed in the same direction for governmental improvement. Lately, however, the courses of action indicated by the second and third values have been not only different, but contradictory; the cleavage is becoming increasingly apparent in the doctrines of public administration. What the effects will be on the fraternity of practitioners and on their aspirations to professional status is difficult to say, but it seems clear that commitments to values that have become incompatible can produce only gulfs in the realm of ideas and confusion in proposals for governmental reform.

---

* This is a revision of a paper prepared for the Panel on "The Study of Public Administration Since Woodrow Wilson" at the 52nd Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association on September 7, 1956, at Washington, D. C.

[1] "Although the art of administration has been practiced for centuries, it has not been widely written about until recent times . . . . The study of public administration has advanced to an extraordinary degree since 1920 . . . . (T)he study of public administration is still primarily American." Leonard D. White, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, 4th edition (New York, 1955), pp. 9, 10, 11.

[2] To be sure, the three values, which will be examined in turn, are not the only ones to be fulfilled by the governmental system, but the design and functioning of the government have been such that these appear to have received prime stress in the ordering of our political life.

The Quest for Representativeness. The earliest[3] stress was placed on representativeness in government, the quest for which clearly had its roots in the colonial period, when colonial assemblies were struggling with royal governors for control of political life in the New World and "No taxation without representation" was a slogan that expressed one of the principal interests and anxieties of the colonists. The legislatures thus became the champions of the indigenous population, or at least of the ruling elements in the colonies, against what was regarded in many quarters as executive oppression. When the Revolution drove the British out, the legislatures in the new states were, with but a couple of exceptions,[4] enthroned in positions of leadership of the new governments, and, although the franchise continued to be limited to a relatively small proportion of the people, it was through the legislatures that governmental policy was formulated and legitimated. Even in the states that continued to operate under their colonial charters in the post-Revolutionary years, the governors were reduced to figureheads with little influence in the making of governmental decisions. In ten of the states, the governors were elected by the legislatures, most of them for only one-year terms; in just one state did the governor have a veto, and even that was limited by present-day standards. Governors had few powers of appointment and removal, or of administrative supervision and control. They did not function as legislative leaders. Lacking in status and in constitutional and administrative strength, governors had no source of political strength, and they therefore remained subordinate to the legislatures in every respect; they had no leverage with which to exert influence even if they had been so inclined. Hence, the office was regarded as primarily ceremonial and a symbol of honor rather than as a seat of power, and it therefore rarely attracted men of distinction in the early days of the Republic. Consequently, as late as the opening years of the Twentieth Century, the governorship was a dead-end road. As one authority has remarked, they served their short terms and returned to private life with few accomplishments behind them and nothing before them but the pleasure of being called "Governor" for the rest of their days.[5] The legislatures ruled virtually unchallenged.

---

[3] It is impossible to date any of the periods with precision, except arbitrarily, and it is probably unnecessary to do so for most purposes, but their origins can be identified, and so, roughly, can their zeniths.

[4] New York and Massachusetts. These states provided important models for the federal executive, which ultimately was set up as an even stronger—and perhaps better—office than its prototypes.

[5] There were notable exceptions of course. Cleveland became President after serving as Governor of New York, Hayes and McKinley had both been Governors of Ohio before moving to the White House, and other governors became influential in national politics. As a general rule, however, the governorship was not a springboard to power or prominence.

In local government, too, collegiate bodies were in charge. Whether they were truly "representative," and whether one ought to refer to the governing organ of a community that is not "sovereign" as a legislature, are questions we need not consider here. Suffice it to say that local executives labored under the same or perhaps greater handicaps than their state counterparts and therefore presented no more of a challenge to the local institutions corresponding to legislatures than did the governors to the state bodies.

The constitutional specifications for the Presidency constituted a countertrend to the apparent value system of governmental designers in early America. For the President was invested with greater authority than almost any other chief executive of the time. Yet even at the federal level, there were clearly widespread expectations that the Congress would provide the primary motive power for the government, a view shared, according to Binkley, even by many incumbents of the White House whose "Whig conception" of the Presidency as subservient to the legislature may be contrasted with the "stewardship theory" of independent Presidential authority to be enunciated much later in history. While Washington and Jefferson fought to protect and extend executive power from the very first, it is probably not stretching the facts to argue that Presidents for a long time had an uphill struggle in this effort, and that many chose to yield to the sentiment of the day and the strength of the giants in Congress. Whether or not the legislatures were actually the most representative institutions need not be explored here; there is ample evidence that they were thought to be so.

The enthronement of the legislature was one of the two major tangible indications of the value placed on representativeness; the other was the rather uncritical faith in the electoral principle. It began with the extension of the franchise and a thrust toward universal adult suffrage. But the faith in elections also took the form of an increasing number of official positions filled by balloting. The first half of the Nineteenth Century saw the number of elective offices sharply increased, especially after the Jacksonian Revolution burst upon the country. The ballot grew in length until almost every public official from President down to dogcatcher came to power via the electoral route. Moreover, with the rise of the party organizations to new influence as a result, even those positions which were not made elective were filled by party faithful; the spoils system came into its own. By the time of the Civil War, voters found themselves confronted by hundreds of names on their ballots, and each change of party brought with it a change in virtually all government employees.

The Quest for Neutral Competence. As early as the middle of the Nineteenth Century, it had become clear to some people that legislative supremacy, the long ballot, and the spoils system did not in fact increase representativeness; as a matter of fact, they often seemed to have just the opposite effect. For one thing, they tended to confuse both voters and interest groups and thereby opened the way to power to political bosses who, while providing a measure of integration in the bewildering pullulation of government, often utilized their positions to advance their personal interests and the interests of the organizations they headed without regard for the interests of many of the governed. For another thing, legislators and administrators at every level of government proved themselves peculiarly vulnerable to the forces let loose by the burgeoning industrial system; corruption beset legislatures from county boards and city councils right up to Congress itself, and the venality and incompetence of many public officers and employers were common knowledge.

Disillusionment with existing governmental machinery was a result. State and local constitutions and charters grew longer and more detailed as reformers tried to reduce the discretion of legislative bodies. Limitations on the length and frequency of state legislative sessions were imposed to limit the amount of harm they could do. And at every level, reformers began to cast around for new governmental machinery that would provide a high level of responsible government service while avoiding the high costs of unalloyed representative mechanisms.

Thus began the quest for neutral competence in government officials, a quest which has continued to the present day. The core value of this search was ability to do the work of government expertly, and to do it according to explicit, objective standards rather than to personal or party or other obligations and loyalties.[6] The slogan of the neutral competence school became, "Take ✓administration out of politics."

This school produced its own rationale and mechanisms for this purpose. The rationale was the now-familiar politics-administration dichotomy, according to which politics and administration are distinct and separable processes that should therefore be assigned to separate and distinct organs. The mechanisms were independent boards and commissions and the merit system, which were designed to insulate many public officials and public policies from political pressures.

The movement gathered momentum after the Civil War, although the first agitation for some of its objectives goes back even further. In local and state governments, library boards and park boards and police boards and boards of health and finance boards and utilities commissions and boards of education and boards of assessment and equalization and boards and commissions for a dozen other purposes mushroomed up all over the governmental landscape. At the federal level, the Interstate Commerce Commission came into being, to be followed in the Twentieth Century by a host of like bodies. These agencies, at every level, differed from each other in details, but had the same underlying structure: their members were appointed for overlapping terms supposedly on the basis of their reputations for general ability and character and specialized knowledge. They were granted wide discretion and secure tenure for substantial periods, and were expected to formulate policy on nonpolitical premises. Objectivity was reinforced in some instances by mandatory bipartisan membership on the boards. The exigencies of the times made it necessary for legislatures to delegate power to administrative agencies; the advocates of neutral competence deflected delegation from the chief executives and the departments under their control to what was later to be branded "the headless fourth branch of government."

---

[6] Proponents of this value generally did not demean representative institutions; on the contrary, they claimed their programs would strengthen those institutions by rationalizing governmental operations and improving their quality to such an extent that elected officers would be in a position to exert greater control over policy than they ever could hope to do in the prevailing political jungle. The case for neutral competence has normally been made not as an alternative to representativeness, but as a fulfillment of it.

The disillusionment of some was so thorough, however, that they lost faith completely in representativeness, in the capacity of a people to rule themselves, and returned to advocacy of rule by an aristocracy of talent. Civil service reform was, in fact, a movement which found its leaders among the grandsons and great-grandsons of the "Patricians" of early days, among the "Old Whigs" and their sons, among those who had been enamored of, or grew up under, British or German or French institutions (for example, the Adamses, Godkin, Schurz, Villard, Rosengarten), and among the urban mercantile and older businesses or professions rather than among the new industrialists. Distrust of the populace may still be observed in some modern writers and even in some current supporters of the neutral competence idea, but, for the most part, the concept of representation was so deeply ingrained in American thinking—and, indeed, in American emotions, for the word has become a revered one—that few dare to attack it openly whatever their beliefs may be.

The merit system, peculiarly, made its greatest advances where boards and commissions were slowest to gain a foothold—the federal government. Pressure for the merit system began before the Civil War; its first fruit was the federal Civil Service Act of 1883. Initially, the objectives of the program were confined principally to controlling the selection of government workers by taking the power to hire staff from the hands of executive heads (who were politicians) and lodging it with experts who, if they did not actually appoint personnel, at least could screen out all but those who could pass tests of one sort or another. This aspect of the program spread rapidly in the federal government; despite the subsequent growth of the federal service, about nine out of ten government employees today are under some form of merit appointment. But the process did not stop with the removal of the appointing power from politics; over the years, the Civil Service Commission extended its surveillance to dismissal, promotion, and position classification; eventually, with the aid of new legislation, the political activities of civil servants were reduced to little more than voting. A wall was erected between the government bureaucracy and the politicians, a wall policed by the Civil Service Commission.[7]

The quest for neutral competence, though it began about a century ago, has never waned. The training of civil servants became steadily more formal and systematic as time passed; courses, departments, and even schools of administration appeared in universities. Organization and methods analysis became a profession in itself. Boards and commissions are still common modes of handling administrative problems—witness, for example, the Atomic Energy Commission. Supporters of the merit system continue unabated their efforts to extend it "upward, outward, and downward." The desire to make government employment an attractive career service was given new voice by the Commission of Inquiry on Public Service Personnel a generation ago, and by the Task Force on Personnel and Civil Service of the Second Hoover Commission more recently. The city manager plan—and even the town, county, and state manager plans—have continued to score successes. Neutral competence is still a living value among students of government, career civil servants, and, perhaps more significantly, among much of the general populace.

---

[7] The states and localities were slow to follow suit. By the turn of the century, only two states had enacted civil service legislation and only a few of the largest cities. Even today, the formal merit system still has a long way to go at these levels: states and localities remain the prime targets of the civil service reformers. But they have made some impressive gains during the last quarter-century, and the idea is still spreading.

The Quest for Executive Leadership. Just as the excessive emphasis on representativeness brought with it bitterly disappointing difficulties unforeseen by its advocates, so too the great stress on neutral competence proved to be a mixed blessing. And just as the failures of the machinery established with an eye primarily to representativeness helped produce the reaction toward neutral competence, so too the weaknesses of the governmental arrangements devised by the latter school—or, more accurately, the weaknesses of government resulting from the work of *both* schools—gave impetus to the supporters of a third value: executive leadership.

For both earlier philosophies, and the mechanisms to which they gave rise, created a thrust toward fragmentation of government, toward the formation of highly independent islands of decision-making occupied by officials who went about their business without much reference to each other or to other organs of government. Neither elected administrative officials nor independent boards and commissions welcomed direction from the chief executives; the former were supported by constituencies in much the same way as governors and mayors, and their tenure was linked largely to their vote-getting prowess, while the latter generally remained in office longer than the chief executives and depended very little on them for support. Besides, as these officials and agencies became more accomplished in their respective areas of specialization, they tended to resent efforts of "laymen" and "amateurs" to intervene; this tendency revealed itself even in some civil servants nominally under the chief executives, who, though formally subject to dismissal, turned out in practice to have quite secure tenure, and who, by adept maneuvers in negotiating bureaucratic armistices ("memoranda of agreement") and in forming alliances with legislative committees and clientele groups, succeeded in carving out for themselves broad areas of discretion free of real supervision by their political chiefs.

The drive toward fragmentation could not be effectively countered by legislative bodies, despite their vast statute-making, financial, and investigative powers. Even Congress can exercise only a general and intermittent oversight over administrative agencies, and has had to confine itself to providing general standards guiding the exercise of administrative discretion and to occasional intervention to correct abuses or to force specific changes in policy. And state legislatures and city councils and county boards operate under still greater limitations; many of these bodies are in session for only brief periods out of each year (or biennium), and administrative officials conduct the business of government with great latitude in the long intervals between meetings. Moreover, even if legislatures met often enough and had enough technical assistance of their own to exert control over administration, their composition and procedures would render them incapable of providing integration; working through tens of committees, reaching decisions through processes of compromise and concession among representatives of small territorials units, functioning increasingly as reviewing bodies for proposals placed before them by executive and administrative agencies and by interest groups, they are generally too slow and too fragmented to perform this function effectively.

Neither have the courts been able to integrate the component elements of American government. They were not designed for this responsibility, and they are completely unable to discharge it. Limited to refereeing disputes between contending parties, formal in procedure and deliberate in method, they could not play this role even had they been willing. In fact, they have increasingly moved toward acceptance of findings of fact by administrative organizations and toward restriction of their own activities to review of questions of jurisdiction and procedure.

The centrifugal drives of the representativeness and neutral competence institutions thus found no important counter-force in the legislatures or in the courts. So the efforts to maximize these values brought with them the dispersion of governmental policy-making processes.

There were widespread criticisms of this fragmentation.[8] It bred chaos; agencies pursued contradictory policies in related fields. It fomented conflict; agencies engaged in bitter bureaucratic warfare to establish their spheres of jurisdiction. It opened gaps in the provision of service or of regulation; clienteles were sometimes denied benefits or escaped supervision because they fell between agencies. It was costly; many agencies maintained overhead organizations that could have been replaced more cheaply and effectively by a common organization, and citizens had to make their own way through bureaucratic labyrinths. And, most important of all, it led to irresponsibility; no one quite knew how the pattern of organization and program came into existence or what could be done to alter it, each segment of the fragmented governments became a self-directing unit, the impact of elections on the conduct of government was minimized, and special interest groups often succeeded in virtually capturing control of individual agencies. No one seemed to be steering the governmental machinery, though everyone had a hand in it. At best, it seemed to be drifting (and just when the growth of the economic system appeared to make greater direction necessary), while at worst it showed signs of flying apart or grinding to a stop. These were among the forces that persuaded many students of government that chief executives had to be built up to take charge of the machinery.

The office of the chief executive became their hope because it furnished the only available means of achieving the end sought.[9] Movement toward strengthening chief executives began long before there was an explicit body of doctrine to explain and justify it. In the federal government, it took the form of struggles between Presidents and Congress for control of policy. Since the Presidency was set up with strong constitutional powers at the very start, the battle raged over the breadth of the powers conferred rather than over formal constitutional changes. Those powers were firmly defended, liberally interpreted, and gradually expanded under the strong Presidents from Washington on. The governors, on the other hand, having been granted few powers at the start, gained strength slowly, largely through constitutional amendment, in the course of the Nineteenth Century. In the same period, many city executives developed from mere chairmen of councils to weak mayors and then to strong mayors, and there was even an occasional step in this direction among the rural units of government. These things were taking place even while the emphasis on representativeness was predominant; they continued after the pursuit of neutral competence became the order of the day; but the Twentieth Century was well on its way before executive leadership became a systematic quest supported by articulate theories, and before it really began to gather speed.

---

[8] Criticisms, that is to say, of the fragmentation "in general." When it came to the particular fragments over which they exerted their greatest influence, legislators, bureaucrats, party organizers, and interest groups were often defensive of their special positions and hostile to integrating remedies which might disturb their control.

One of the first signs of the new emphasis was the rapid spread of the executive budget in government. For a long time, agency requests for funds were considered individually, and there was no central point at which total expenditures were reviewed and the competing claims balanced against each other in the light of the resources available; indeed, very often, the only way governments could figure out how much they were spending was to add up the appropriation bills after they had been passed. The reformers turned to the chief executives to rationalize the spending process, and out of it came the now familiar phenomena of executive review and adjustment of agency requests, and the submittal of a comprehensive budget supposed to make it possible to see the overall spending pattern. The practice was often far short of ideal, but, for the first time, chief executives were given a powerful instrument with which to control administrative behavior; it was a major advance in striving to equip them to integrate American government. A few large cities and states adopted budgetary legislation during the first two decades of the Twentieth Century, and the Taft Commission on Efficiency and Economy in 1912 urged such a measure upon the federal government. By the middle of the third decade, many of the largest cities, virtually all of the states, and the federal government had budget laws on the books. Since then, in general, the tendency has been toward continued increase in the budgetary powers of chief executives, and toward adoption of the process by those jurisdictions in which it did not previously obtain. A large body of literature now backs up this practice, and, though the lack of a *theory* of budgeting (as contrasted with beliefs about the appropriate *machinery* for budgeting) has been pointed out, the executive-budget doctrine is widely accepted and rarely challenged.

---

[9] Party bosses occasionally did serve this function, but *only* occasionally, for it must be remembered that our political parties are really congeries of smaller organizations in most places and therefore hardly equipped to provide governmental integration. Besides, they were phenomena from which governmental designers were seeking to deliver the governmental process.

Another indication of the concern with executive leadership is the administrative reorganization movement. It is frequently described as having begun in 1917, when Illinois adopted a sweeping change in its administrative structure, although such measures had been unsuccessfully urged in other states several years earlier. Under this plan, the number of agencies was reduced, and they were grouped into comparatively few departments headed by officials appointed by the governor; an administrative pyramid, with the governor standing at the apex, was the goal; and if it was rarely achieved completely, the extent to which it was approximated is indeed remarkable considering the degree of fragmentation prior to the changes. The number of elected administrative officials was sharply diminished, and ballots became correspondingly shorter. The appointing and removal power of the governor was also increased. In a single vast upheaval, the reorganizers sought to elevate him from an almost impotent exhorter to a powerful leader; if their efforts did not—as they could not—*immediately* produce the consequences sought, it was not very long before they began to bear fruit. Administratively and politically, the Illinois governor ascended to new eminence and influence. And more than half the states, some cities, and a few counties and towns, followed Illinois' lead. All during the 'twenties and 'thirties, surveys of government machinery were commonplace, and they became even more so after World War II as the first federal Hoover Commission touched off a wave of "little Hoover Commissions" in the states and many cities. "Concentration of authority and responsibility," "functional integration," "direct lines of responsibility," "grouping of related services," "elimination of overlapping and duplication," and "need for coordination" echoed through state capitols, city and town halls, and even through some county courthouses as chief executives became the new center of governmental design.

At the federal level, there were occasional adjustments and readjustments in the machinery of government in the early part of the century, and the President was even invested with broad powers of reorganization during the emergencies of World War I and the depression. But it was not until the mushrooming agencies of the New Deal strained that machinery to its limits that the practices and supporting dogmas of the reorganizers made their appearance in strength in Washington. Few clearer statements of the executive leadership value than the *Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management* have ever been published;[10] with its recommendations on pulling the administrative functions of the independent regulatory commissions back under the President,[11] on drawing the government corporations back into the hierarchy,[12] on bringing personnel management under close direction by the President, on strengthening the White House staff, on getting the General Accounting Office out of the pre-auditing field and returning this operation to the executive branch, and in the tightly reasoned explanations of these recommendations (which were tied to the peg of the separation of powers), the Committee offered the classic presentation of the reorganization aspects of the executive leadership school.[13]

---

[10] And no clearer or more scholarly justifications of this value than E. Pendleton Herring, *Public Administration and the Public Interest* (New York, 1936).

The Reorganization Act of 1939, which reversed one formal relationship of the President to Congress by conferring initiatory responsibility for reorganization plans on the former and authorizing the latter in effect to veto such proposals, reflected in practice the theory of the Report; even the frequent use of the legislative veto does not reduce the significance of this expansion of executive power, and the fierceness of the periodic battles over renewal of the Act suggests both Congressmen and Presidents are conscious of this significance. In the course of the years since the Report, without much fanfare, other recommendations of the Committee have been put into practice, too; the influence of the Committee continued to make itself felt for a long time.

The first Hoover Commission was considerably less emphatic about strengthening the chief executive than its predecessor, and the second Hoover Commission has displayed, if anything, some coldness (if not outright hostility) to the concept. It is conceivable, therefore, that the reorganization movement has for the time being run its course in the federal government. But it would probably be an error to write off entirely this phase of the quest for executive leadership.

A third index of this quest, an index related to, but distinguishable from, the developments in budgeting and administrative reorganization, is the increase in the size of executive staffs. The archetype is the Executive Office of the President with its hundreds of specialists providing the President with advice on every aspect of policy, reviewing legislative proposals to work out the Presidential attitude, studying administrative management from the President's point of view, planning, researching, furnishing legal counsel, serving as a source of information alternative and supplementary to the formal hierarchy, and studded with "the President's men," responsible and loyal to him and him alone. This is a far cry from the days when a President's secretariat consisted of a few aides who helped him with his official correspondence; it has helped to give the chief executive the means with which to direct the administration he heads and to formulate programs and press them into statute and then into operation; it has helped make him a real center of political and administrative power. In like fashion, the executive offices of many of the governors have been transformed into instruments of leadership, and some local executives have been similarly equipped; at these levels, the evolution as been somewhat less dramatic, but not much less effective. The tendencies may be uneven in their fulfillment, but they are pronounced.

---

[11] This point of view received additional support at the state level, although in restrained tones, from James W. Fesler in his *The Independence of State Regulatory Commissions* (Chicago, 1942).

[12] See also, for example, V. O. Key, Jr., "Government Corporations," in Fritz M. Marx, ed., *Elements of Public Administration* (New York, 1946).

[13] To be sure, the Committee also advocated expansion of the merit system, and restated the argument that stronger executive leadership would mean greater popular control of government (i.e., representativeness), thus indicating how deep-seated these parallel values were. But this cannot obscure the basic premises of the Committee's Report, nor negate its general impact: it is overwhelmingly for executive leadership in sentiment.

Doctrinally, the sharp conceptual cleavage between politics and administration, which gained currency during the years when neutral competence was ascendent, and which served as such a useful philosophical prop for the machinery favored in those years, became an impediment to the justification of executive leadership. For one thing, chief executives, in whom administrative responsibility and power were to be lodged, were also partisan politicians. Moreover, one of the main reasons advanced for seeking integration was elimination of the fragmentation resulting from acceptance of the idea of the separability of politics and administration. Gradually, therefore, the politics-administration dichotomy fell out of favor in public administration, and the doctrine of the continuity of the policy-formulating process, better suited to the aims of executive leadership, began to replace it. Before long, the traditional orthodoxy became old-fashioned and found few defenders.

By every measure, then, the years from 1910 to 1950 were characterized by the rise of the quest for executive leadership to a place of pre-eminence in administrative thought and action.

The Concurrence of Values. For expository purposes, the quest for the three values has here been treated as sequential, and, to be sure, each had a different high point in time. Nevertheless, it is worth pausing to reiterate that at no point was any of them pursued to the complete exclusion of one or both of the others; evidence of interest in all three can be found at any stage of our history, sometimes in a single document by a single author. As has been observed, the defense of any one was often framed in terms of advancement of the others simultaneously. The story is thus one of changing balance among the values, not of total displacement.

II. THE COALITION

For many years, the proponents of neutral competence and the partisans of executive leadership were able to make common cause, and their alliance became so imbedded in their thinking that the differences between them were hardly recognized. The divisive factors beginning to emerge today then lay hidden beneath the mutual striving after a shared goal—a merit system to

---

[14] "Merit system" and "spoils system," as used in this section of this paper, include, but are not restricted to, personnel management. Patronage, it will be seen, is but one aspect—albeit the principal one—of spoils, which includes contracts, purchases, and other "favors." The remedies of the reformers were aimed at every aspect.

replace the spoils system.[14] Much of the standard literature of public administration was written during this honeymoon period and therefore embraced both values at once.

That the members of the neutral competence school should support the merit system as against the spoils system is not at all surprising; this reform lay at the core of their program for redesigning governmental organization. But it does require some explanation to account for the position of the executive leadership people, since spoils were allegedly one of the most effective devices through which executive influence could be exerted. There would seem to be a contradiction between advocacy of measures to strengthen executives on the one hand and endorsement of a system that appeared to reduce executive influence on the other.

The contradiction is more apparent than real. The spoils system had its uses for chief executives, but, as it operated in this country, it never really gave these officers control of the administrative hierarchy. As a source of inducements to persuade legislators to support executive-sponsored measures, it was quite helpful at times. It was also valuable in providing incentives to attract workers for the parties. But it never furnished the executives with loyal, enthusiastic, capable, disciplined administrative machines; it did not make them chief administrators.

Federal patronage, for example, about which more is known than has been revealed about patronage practices at any other level of government, was distributed largely through Senators and Representatives, hopefully in return for the legislators' votes on issues in which the Presidents were interested. But Congressmen ordinarily had to farm out their patronage to the party organizations in their states and districts, and even dissident wings of Presidential parties which did not give Presidential measures consistent support in the legislative chambers could often count on nominating some federal appointees. During election campaigns the Presidents needed the support of all segments of the parties and could not, therefore, afford to weaken them for their legislative defections. In short, the patronage system strengthened party leaders and legislators more than it did executives. Thus the appointing power of the Presidents was bargained away—shrewdly sometimes, to be sure, from the point of view of legislation and of political survival, but at some cost from the standpoint of administrative management. Moreover, if a President's own nomination was itself the result of bargaining in which he was the chosen rather than the chooser, then his appointing power was largely taken away at the start.

It was not just a matter of creating "ten enemies and one ingrate" with every appointment. Equally important, patronage tended to fragment the executive branch as much as did election of administrative officers. For the loyalty of appointees who owed their positions only formally to the appointing official, but in fact to the state and local party units that nominated them, lay with the nominating powers. In the exercise of their legal authorizations, the appointees tended to be as responsive to individual legislators, local and state party leaders, and local community pressures as to their nominal superiors in the hierarchy. Moreover, since their tenure was sure to be cut short as soon as the opposing party won an election, they tried to squeeze all they could out of their posts while they occupied them; their own personal interests, therefore, were likely to take precedence over official directives when the two conflicted. Trying to lead such a staff was like trying to play croquet in Wonderland; subordinates, like the mallets, balls, and wickets of the fairy tale, operated with a high degree of independence.

To the supporters of executive leadership, it was clear that the lateral pulls of political parties and individual legislators had to be reduced, and the incentives for public employees to exploit their offices for personal advantage eliminated. Only then could the other means of building up executive influence be made effective; only then could the President assert his authority over administration. So the executive leadership supporters joined the defenders of neutral competence in the drive toward a merit system of appointment, expecting that a bureaucracy chosen by objective standards would be at least as responsive to Presidential direction as to party and legislative pressures. A merit system of appointment controlled by a Civil Service Commission thus served the ends of two schools of thought; for different reasons, and in pursuit of different goals, they united behind it.

Similar factors apparently operated to promote the adoption of objective standards of practice for other activities corrupted by the spoils system. Political discrimination in public contracting, public works, government purchasing, granting of charters and franchises, distribution of benefits and subsidies, and the enforcement of the law, provided a harvest mainly reaped by state and local party and government leaders. These practices, too, gave a bit of leverage to executives in their legislative and political roles, but they did nothing for executive control of the executive branch. So the executive leadership school approved and worked for the adoption of rigorous statutory limitations, cutting party and individual legislators out of these processes as far as possible just as the civil service system freed the appointing process from their depredations. Here, too, though apparently striving for different objectives, the neutral competence and executive leadership groups joined hands.

Consequently, the flood of literature on public administration after World War I unanimously applauded many of the measures designed to take government out of politics. By the 'thirties, however, as the emphasis on executive leadership increased, evidences of discord grew more persistent.

III. THE EMERGING CONFLICT

In thirty years the number of federal civilian employees has more than quadrupled. If power were measurable, the federal bureaucracy's power would probably turn out to have increased by an even greater factor: Governmental policy is now formulated in administrative regulations and orders, as the growth of the Federal Register vividly attests; judicial proceedings before administrative agencies probably exceed in quantity those before the courts; licensing and administrative decisions regarding benefits and subsidies, are the order of the day; and all of this is handled by administrative officials under the very broadest of mandates from Congress and the President. Much of our legislation originates in administrative agencies, and most proposed legislation is submitted to such agencies to determine what the President's position on it ought to be. A corresponding growth of administrative influence has taken place in all large-scale organizations, both governmental and private, but few have a record as dramatic in this respect as the federal government.

The growth of governmental bureaucracy in size and importance was subjected to vehement attacks in this country and abroad. For the most part, however, the attacks were disregarded, especially by political scientists, because it was clear that they were not aimed at the bureaucracy *per se*, but at the governmental *programs* administered by the civil servants. The programs themselves were too popular for their critics to assail directly with any real hope of success; the assault therefore took an oblique approach, hitting at what appeared to be a more vulnerable target. The criticism was therefore not taken very seriously in the study of public administration. Students of this subject became ardent and sometimes uncritical defenders of bureaucrats. Now that the controversy over the New Deal has subsided, however, the bureaucracy itself is more or less taken for granted, and attacks upon it are less frequent, less vehement, and less publicized than they once were. This has helped students ✓of public administration to take a somewhat more dispassionate view of the bureaucracy, and some second thoughts may be at hand.

For though the mechanisms of neutral competence were remarkably successful in reducing the influence of the political parties on the administrative hierarchy, they did not necessarily increase the President's control over administration. Rather, they encouraged the development of "self-directing" groups within the bureaucracy, and these groups in turn cultivated their own sources of support among professional groups concerned with the subject matter over which the services have jurisdiction, among their clienteles, and among appropriate Congressional committees and subcommittees. The components of the "neutral" bureaucracy, by virtue of their expertness and information and alliances, have become independent sources of decision-making power, and Presidents will probably find them no easier to direct—indeed, perhaps even more intractable, than their partisan predecessors.

As a consequence, some of the standard devices for promoting neutral competence have been openly questioned in the literature of public administration. As noted earlier, the independence of regulatory commissions and government corporations has been vigorously criticized. ✓ The Brownlow Committee also sought to make personnel management an arm of the White House and to confine the Civil Service Commission to quasi-judicial functions and a role as "watchdog" of the merit system. This principle was endorsed recently by the staff of the Temporary (New York) State Commission on Coordination of State Activities, by a minority (comprising 11 members) of the Mayor's Committee on Management Survey of the City of New York, by the Sixth American

Assembly,[15] and, implicitly, by the present administration in Washington, under which the chairman of the Civil Service Commission serves as administrative head of that agency and is located in the executive mansion. A rising chorus of voices has also begun to call for decentralization of authority for personnel management to line departments,[16] a position stated with particular clarity and force by Commissioner James K. Pollock of the first Hoover Commission in a minority report on personnel. The establishment of Schedule C in the Federal government service in 1953, rolling back merit system protections from a number of positions of a policy-making and confidential character, despite the partisan components of the impetus behind this move, was in large measure an effort to preserve the power of the President over policy. More recently, the arguments of the second Hoover Commission for extension of civil service protections to the very highest administrative officials (in the form of a "senior civil service") have been sharply questioned.[17] Recommendations for an institutionalized corps of political executives have been assailed as likely to weaken the President.[18] The premises of the city-manager plan have been described as inapplicable to large cities, and some spirited defenses of elected mayors have appeared.[19] And all of these views have been reflected in the kinds of administrative improvements adopted in many jurisdictions in recent years. Other similar defections from the coalition between the neutrality and the leadership camps can be found in current literature and practice, but it is not necessary to labor the point; patently, these straws in the wind are examples of the growing divergence between the two philosophies that makes it increasingly doubtful that their adherents will continue to support the same governmental theories or reforms.

Moreover, the philosophical divisions over structural values among the scholars have been intensified by differing political—i.e., program—views. Many of the champions of increased governmenal activities, in the realms both of services (welfare, financial, industrial) and economic regulation, tend to rally behind chief executives and especially behind the President. The reason is fairly obvious: Demands for expansion of government service and regulation originate frequently (though not exclusively) in urban areas, and urban areas have their greatest political effect on the election of chief executives and their smallest impact on the state legislatures and Congress, where they are substantially underrepresented. So executives tend generally to be more sympathetic to those demands than do the legislators, and those who favor an expanding role for government look to elected executives, as a rule, when they want to impress their preferences on governmental policy. Quite apart, then, from the concern about the organizational problems created by fragmentation of government, there are considerations of political preference and strategy that generate support for executive leadership.

---

[15] *Staff Report on Civil Service*, State of New York Legislative Document No. 42 (1953); *Modern Management for the City of New York* (1953), Vol. 2, pp. 216 ff.; *The Federal Government Service* (New York: Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, 1954), with special emphasis on Chapter 2, "The President, Congress, and the Federal Government Service," by Herman M. Somers.

[16] Cf., Norman J. Powell, *Personnel Administration in Government* (New York, 1956), pp. 164–71.

[17] E.g., Herman M. Somers, "Some Reservations about the Senior Civil Service," *Personnel Administration*, Vol. 19, pp. 10 ff. (January–February, 1956); and Paul P. Van Riper, *The Dialectics of the Civil Service* (mimeo., Cornell University, 1956).

[18] See the papers (mimeo.) delivered by Harlan Cleveland and Wallace S. Sayre at the Conference on the Political Executive, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton, New Jersey, March, 1956.

[19] See Temporary (New York) State Commission to Study the Organizational Structure of the Government of the City of New York, *Four Steps to Better Government of New York City* (1953), Chapter 2; Wallace S. Sayre, "The General Manager Idea for Large Cities," *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 14, pp. 253 ff. (Autumn, 1954).

By the same token, there are issues of political attitudes and tactics that engender enthusiasm for legislative bodies regardless of questions of representativeness. Legislatures, because of the composition and the sources of their political strength, offer the greatest leverage to those who resist the growth of governmental activities—or, more accurately, who oppose those governmental activities sought by urban populations. Not, then, because legislatures are more representative, but because this is where the backers of a particular political attitude can exert their greatest political stength, many individuals recommend in their proposals for governmental reform that these bodies be strengthened both relatively and absolutely.

Finally, it might be inferred that some reformers distrust all politicians and electorates and pin their hopes on the expertise and efficiency of a professionalized bureaucracy. They seem to be moved not merely by a concern for governmental structure but by political values that include an implicit contempt for what we ordinarily understand to be the democratic process and an explicit respect for an aristocracy of talent that borders on a latter-day faith in technocracy.[20]

So the tendencies toward division reinforce each other, and there are no visible factors thrusting toward alliances like that fortuitous one developed by a peculiar conjunction of circumstances during the infancy of public administration as an academic and occupational specialty. As a result, the language of public administration is likely to become increasingly strategic and tactical in tone rather than "scientific." Just as the naked power issues of the legislatively oriented groups came to the surface in the recent efforts to weaken the Presidency—viz., the Twenty-Second Amendment, which reduces the leadership potential of a President in his second term; the efforts to strip away Presidential reorganization authority in 1953; the fight over the proposed Bricker Amendment; the continuing efforts to revamp the Electoral College in such a way as to reduce the political effectiveness of the urban-labor-liberal entente that has been partly responsible for the aggressive and expansive use of Presidential power—so, too, many of the reorganization issues will be discussed in power terms in the future as the public administration groups aligned with the executive and with the bureaucracy, respectively, pull apart. The question that will be asked about suggested reorganizations is not, "What, according to the canons of management science, is the best organization?" but, "What will be the effect of this measure on the institution we support?" The differences in the answers will sharpen the theoretical distinctions between the wings of the public administration group and hasten estrangement of the factions.[21]

---

[20] There would seem to be an emergent split within this group. Some backers of a professionalized public service are apparently thinking in terms of a corps of administrative generalists to occupy the top levels of administrative agencies regardless of agency subject matter. Others seem to conceive of an administrative elite of occupational specialists—engineers, lawyers, doctors, social workers, foresters, etc.

To many students of public administration trained in the 'twenties, 'thirties, and 'forties, the new atmosphere will be a strange and perhaps a bewildering one, fraught with hostilities. To students trained in the 'sixties, the literature of the earlier period, with its "principles," may seem quaint and even naive. Political scientists of the remoter future, looking back, may well conclude that it is not easy to bridge the gap between a generation seeking to encourage the growth of a professional bureaucracy and a generation in turmoil over how to control it.

---

[21] One may even hazard the guess that the American Society for Public Administration will remain firmly in the hands of the neutral competence group while the executive leadership school in public administration looks more and more to the American Political Science Association as its forum.

THE LIMITS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE: HENRY ADAMS' QUEST FOR ORDER*

HENRY S. KARIEL
Harvard University

Contemporary social scientists generally regard Henry Adams as a brilliant but erratic figure in the history of American thought. Their image of him is that of a gifted but unreliable and unscientific writer. Yet it is striking how, upon a re-examination of his approach to his world, there emerges a cluster of attitudes and preoccupations which clearly anticipate much of what is significant in the work of these social scientists themselves. The reason why Adams is not, however, regarded as a forerunner of present-day students of society is that he never kept himself from pushing his theories to conclusions. If those who share his scientific ideals must ultimately reach his conclusions, the limits of their science might be exposed by a reconsideration of his personal battle, of his peculiar pains, trials, and failures.

Anticipating familiar tendencies, Adams made a case for irrationalism insofar as he pleaded for the conversion of theory into action; for conservatism insofar as he supported the reduction of discords by a manipulative science of means; and for elitism insofar as he permitted the practitioners of empirical science to settle the social conflicts left open to debate by the traditional methods of politics and philosophy. But Adams' formulation of this case was more than merely prescient. It was so consistent, elaborate, and thoroughgoing—and yet so free from the burden of technical jargon—that intentions and goals unclear or concealed in modern social science may be illuminated by a retracing of his search for genuine knowledge of society, by a retracing of his tenacious effort to cut through an infinite succession of wholly baffling events.

It is apparent from both Adams' "study of twentieth-century multiplicity," the subtitle he gave his *Education*, and his prodigious correspondence that the environment in which he had found himself never ceased to baffle him. From the moment when, as a young man, he was mystified by the behavior of English diplomats to the time he constructed his final survey of the meaning of history, Adams was to remain impressed by the inexplicability of politics and society, of nature and culture, of life and death. He saw unmanageable, incoherent forces frustrating, twisting, and deflecting all human plans. Nothing ever, it seemed, turned out as schemed. British statesmanship during the American Civil War was "a pointless puzzle." That Senator Sumner and Secretary Hoar should become the victims of the Grant Administration was a meaningless fact. After a study of Secretary Seward, it was impossible to conclude which part of him "was the mask and which was the features." The political machinery and the moral standards supporting "an eternity of Grants, or even of Garfields or of Conklings or of Jay Goulds" were, for Adams, incon-

---

* The writer wishes to thank his own students as well as the Foundation for American Studies for having given him ample opportunity to have this study debated and criticized.

ceivable. The panic of 1893 was beyond understanding, the cultural output of Paris at the turn of the century a chaos, Paris and London "fantastic," Garibaldi an inscrutable sphinx, the ruins of Rome "bewildering." Confronted by the fact that his sister was painfully dying, he could not help but conclude the senselessness of it all. Nature itself, in the form of Mont Blanc, "looked to him what it was—a chaos of anarchic and purposeless forces."

> Once more [Adams wrote Charles Milnes Gaskell in 1907] I find myself pitchforked across the ocean into this inconceivable kettle of absurd humanity, and the only change is that I feel each time more bewildered than before by the fact of my own continued existence, which seems now to connect back with nothing. This world has no relation whatever with my world, and I go on living in dreams. . . .[1]

The universe, in its very foundations, was incomprehensible, profoundly meaningless and absurd. Where it had been possible for John Adams and John Quincy Adams—as it seemed to their great-grandson and grandson—to see the world whole, where they had really known the relations between experienced events to be perfectly natural and rational, Henry Adams saw these relations as nothing but subjective acts of will. Such acts, to be sure, did connect disconnected events; but the connections were not in the nature of things. They were artificially created by man, established not by reason but by convention or force. To anyone who would honestly look after extricating himself from personal prejudice and social habit, nothing but an infinite number of discrete, opaque facts existed. Behind them was the great void.

However Adams' nineteenth-century contemporaries tied up disparate particulars, whatever resolutions commended themselves to them, he was alienated from their law. "Outlawry," he affirmed, was his peculiar birthright.[2] The existing formulas failed to account for the sequence of events, for the Grants, Garfields, Conklings, and Goulds. With such a sequence, Adams could not come to terms. He was unable to find the unifying terms either in or for his world. Life's tensions and tests, contingencies and mysteries, could not be subordinated to any significant end or purpose.

The alternatives for Adams—for anyone seeking to bear up after denying validity to all points of orientation—were to impose order in practice or to conquer disorder in theory. In his search for education, for an underlying natural law, in his attempt to effect a systematic reduction of variables to some operationally valid framework, Adams might have tried to add his will and his power to existing pressures. He might have acted and imposed order in practice. Yet to a large extent, either he closed the active road himself or the America of his day, constituted as it was, closed it for him.[3] He was not, at any rate, to be the politician. If his concern was ultimately to be with the political order, as indeed it was, he gave little immediate indication of it. If he forever struggled for balance in practice, as he modestly did when, at past fifty, he "solemnly and painfully learned to ride the bicycle,"[3a] he effectively covered this up by concentrating on the problem of balance in theory.

---

[1] Henry Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams* (Boston, 1918, hereafter cited as *Education*), pp. 156, 279, 104; see also Worthington Chauncey Ford, ed., *Letters of Henry Adams: 1858–1891* (Boston, 1930, hereafter cited as *Letters* I), p. 83; *Education*, p. 281; Harold Dean Cater, *Henry Adams and His Friends: A Collection of His Unpublished Letters* (Boston, 1947, hereafter cited as *Cater*), pp. 53, 67; *Education*, pp. 338, 346, 403, 317, 94–5, 92–3, 287–9; Worthington Chauncey Ford, ed., *Letters of Henry Adams: 1892–1918* (Boston, 1930, hereafter cited as *Letters* II), p. 476; *Letters* I, p. 148 and II, pp. 580, 622; respectively. These expressions are but a sampling of Adams' bewilderment; nor do they fully suggest the resulting ennui.

[2] *Education*, p. 243.

Haphazardly yet inflexibly, he set out to perceive a scheme in things which were apparently wholly devoid of scheme, to find reasons for behavior which seemed wholly random and irrational. His encyclopedic, tortuous quest was not only far less playful and idle than Adams managed to make it appear—it actually was desperately serious after the suicide of his wife, an event so irrational that it never did fit the plan of the *Education*—it was also far from superficial. Taking him into virtually all the disciplines of learning, including geology and paleontology, the search was to be life-long. Adams tried everything but the laboratory experiment. Though always carefully rationed out, the energy and passion with which he proceeded would make it appear reasonable to speak of him as being driven. But his style and bearing alone indicate that after every interpretation of Adams as nothing but the frustrated actor, something remains. Adams and not some autonomous drive obviously did the directing. His constant awareness of what he was about makes it evident that he was thoroughly in control. And this fact alone should make it necessary to refrain from psychoanalysis or socio-analysis, to treat his ideas respectfully in and for themselves, to move economically within the circle of his beliefs.

I

What Adams consistently reached for, it should be clear, was "some great generalization which would finish one's clamor to be educated," some constitutive order basic to change, underlying history. He was plainly dismayed by the conception of history as the manifestation of individual actions to be artistically arranged by the historian. And unwilling to conceive of history as nothing but the capricious and indeterminate behavior of men, he hoped to grasp it as the interplay and the interaction of forces, forces which man himself might somehow discern and learn to master.[4] This meant approaching history as something other than one thing happening after another *at random.* It meant finding a *necessary* sequence, necessary relations between events. To find such a plot, or such law, required that Adams disentangle himself from the play that was history.[5] He had to gain, however fleetingly, a moment of insight, a point for perspective. He had to free himself from contingencies and the laws conventionally assumed to govern them, looking upon events from the outside, from some undetermined, freely posited vantage point. Assuming the characteristics of the free-floating intelligentsia made familiar by the sociology of knowledge, Adams expressly recognized the philosopher's need to place himself above history "as though he were a small God immortal and possibly omniscient."[6]

---

[3] Adams had it both ways: he observed that society had "barred" the political courses he wanted to sail (*ibid.*, p. 263); yet he wrote as early as 1864, "I have now studies immediately on hand, that will certainly require a hundred years of incessant activity to complete, so that it is high time to begin. I look forward not without pleasure to a return to my college life at an advanced age." (*Cater*, p. 26; see also *Cater*, p. 312, and *Letters* I, pp. 154, 160, 162, 258).

[3a] *Education*, p. 330.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 224 (see also 472), 300–1, 457, 314. The leading figure of Adams' novel *Democracy* "wanted to see with her own eyes the action of primary forces; to touch with her own hand the massive machinery of society; to measure with her own mind the capacity of the motive power." "What she wished to see, she thought, was the clash of interests . . .

From such an all-determining vantage point, he resolved to lay out a framework exposing history's fixed pattern, coinciding with it. He was to write, that he "had even published a dozen volumes of American history for no other purpose than to satisfy himself whether, by the severest process of stating, with the least possible comment, such facts as seemed sure, in such order as seemed rigorously consequent, he could fix . . . a necessary sequence of human movement."[7] One result of this depersonalization, of the elimination of the subjective and the arbitrary, was the austerity and dryness of his nine-volume *History of the United States During the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison* (1889–91). There he wanted to let the facts, or the documents, speak for themselves, permitting them to reveal their natural order, their objective condition. And indeed he kept his comments repressed, checked himself from embellishing the record, made history as pure and positive as seemed possible.[8]

Yet he fully knew that he could not succeed. Unquestionably, if the short span of history he had covered could be identified with certainty, if it could be positively known, the key to all that followed and preceded would be bared. But the attempt to achieve this by means of traditional historical scholarship was obviously senseless. Adams therefore pushed through to another realm of knowledge for a possible answer to the riddle of man's existence and history —its conception, its end, its very point. "Satisfied that the sequence of men led to nothing and that the sequence of their society could lead no further, . . . he turned at last to the sequence of force. . . . " To wrest an answer from the facts, he turned to the physical sciences, hoping that perhaps their unity "would serve."[9] He accepted, for analytical purposes, not only their specific discoveries

---

the tremendous forces of government, and the machinery of society, at work. What she wanted was POWER." *Democracy* (New York, 1880), pp. 10, 11–12.

[5] As Leo Strauss has shown in *Natural Right and History* (Chicago, 1953), p. 172 *et seq.*, this was precisely the requirement Hobbes had to labor under in order to gain knowledge.

[6] *Letters* I, p. 206.

[7] *Education*, p. 382.

[8] See William H. Jordy, *Henry Adams: Scientific Historian* (New Haven, 1952), pp. 13, 56; for Adams' relation to Comte, see pp. 92–3, 113–20, 254–5. While Jordy's is easily the best intellectual biography of Adams, a full-scale study illuminating both his personality and his complex relation to Western social thought remains to be written.

[9] *Education*, pp. 382, 431.

—for which he has been soundly criticized[10]—but, more crucially, their method and conventions of investigation.

Natural history, it seemed worth assuming, is governed by the same laws as human history. The physical universe and human society are systematically related. A substructure of forces refers to both; knowledge is basically one.[11] There is a pattern in history just as there is in the stuff studied by the physical scientist. This pattern had to be discerned pure and simple, that is, without the subjective presuppositions which spoiled the social physics of Comte and his precursors. As Adams made clear in the undelivered presidential address he communicated to the American Historical Association in 1894,[12] the challenge had been issued to the historian. It was now essential to go beyond mere analogies and to treat man as the physical scientist had been treating nature. The creation of a science of history, Adams wrote, was a most natural tendency of historical scholarship. Historians had to coöperate with the inevitable. "Historians will not, and even if they would they can not, abandon the attempt. Science itself would admit its own failure if it admitted that man, the most important of all its subjects, could not be brought within its range." Historians, Adams wrote, were standing "on the brink of a great generalization that would reduce all history under a law as clear as the laws which govern the material world." The hope for a "self-evident, harmonious, and complete system" emphatically existed. All that was needed was just one sudden inspiration, one corner turned. Sheer persistence and a lucky break—not genius—would pull it off. "The law was certainly there, and as certainly was in places actually visible, to be touched and handled, as though it were a law of chemistry or physics." And if it should be discovered, "if some new Darwin were to demonstrate the laws of historical evolution," historians, while necessarily coming into conflict with that part of the *status quo* for which there could unfortunately be no future, would attain power. Where at present they were deprived of direct access to centers of power or denied themselves the satisfaction of exercising it, they would finally reach its very core. They would be able to achieve control in the realm of practice. Reflective insight would become operative. Writing to Henry Osborn Taylor, Adams suggested in 1905 that "it will not need another century or half century to tip thought upside down. Law, in that case, would disappear as theory or *a priori* principle, and give place to force. Morality would become police."[13] What has been the traditional philosophical quest for knowledge, the indispensable prerequisite for prudent action, would become a dispensable vocation. The body of knowledge concerning first principles being complete, the historical moment to cease philosophizing and to commence action would have arrived. Morality, *a priori* principles, would be justifiably enforced.

---

[10] Jordy, *op. cit.*, pp. 150–1, 163–219; Roy F. Nichols, "The Dynamic Interpretation of History," *New England Quarterly*, Vol. 8, pp. 163–78 (June 1935); see also Robert A. Hume, "Henry Adams's Quest for Certainty," in Hardin Craig, ed., *Stanford Studies in Language and Literature* (Stanford, 1941), pp. 361–73.

[11] "The department of history needs to concert with the departments of biology, sociology, and psychology some common formula or figure to serve their students as a working model for their study of the vital energies; and this figure must be brought into accord with the figures or formulas used by the department of physics and mechanics to serve their students as models for the working of physico-chemical and mechanical energies." Henry Adams, "A Letter to American Teachers of History," in *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma* (New York, 1920, hereafter cited as "Letter"), pp. 137–263, at pp. 261–2. For a modern manifestion, see David L. Miller, "The Unity of Science Movement," *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, Vol. 26, pp. 252–9 (December 1945); and Otto Neurath, Rudolf Carnap, and Charles Morris, eds., *International Encylcopedia of Unified Science* (Chicago, 1955).

[12] *Cater*, p. 328, n. 2.

The method by which the "physicist-historian"[14] might achieve control, the method which yielded Adams' own science of history, was (1) to disregard the view of history as an unbroken, undifferentiated continuum in time, as an even flow of "events," (2) to search for possible *natural*, self-evident breaks in the continuity of history, and (3) to examine the forces[15] in the periods between the breaks. Each of these periods—or phases, as Adams called them—would constitute some sort of equilibrium, more or less stable, which would always be qualitatively modified by suceeding periods. The historian's concern would be with the intensity and potency of the forces composing the respective equilibriums. Having taken account of the intensity of force, assigning values to it, he could engage in comparative analysis and possibly make predictions.

In a generally guarded tone, Adams found it useful to posit the existence of four intelligible, discontinuous periods, and from these he projected a fifth. The first was instinctual; the second, characterized by religious fetishism (beginning some 90,000 years ago and ending in 1600); the third, mechanical (1600–1870); and the last, electrical (1870–1917).[16] He had confidence only in the relative accuracy of the mechanical phase, one he therefore used as base. It was from this base that he consequently projected. Since he had to delimit *some* period, he had to risk the misleading impression created by the specificity of dates. Whatever the impression, however, he was always willing to take or to leave a decade, knowing that this would scarcely affect the ultimate outcome very much.[17]

---

[13] Henry Adams, "The Tendency of History," in *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma*, pp. 125–33 (hereafter cited as "Tendency"), at pp. 126, 127, 128 (see also *Letters* II, p. 49); *Cater*, pp. 558–9.

[14] Henry Adams, "The Rule of Phase Applied to History," in *The Degradation of the Democratic Dogma*, pp. 267–311 (hereafter cited as "Rule"), at p. 310.

[15] Force Adams defined as "anything that does, or helps to do work." Scientific hypotheses as well as reason itself were seen as but dependent, contingent forces. *Education*, pp. 388, 474; "Letter," p. 208.

[16] "Between the dynamo in the gallery of machines and the engine-house outside, the break of continuity amounted to abysmal fracture for a historian's objects. No more relation could he discover between the steam and the electric current than between the Cross and cathedral." *Education*, p. 381.

[17] See "Rule," p. 308, also see *Cater*, p. 529 where Adams looks roughly 100 years ahead, or *Letters*, II, p. 83, where he speaks of 200 years. Later, a triangulation of the development of the ocean steamer brings him to 1927; he allusively maintains, however, that an expert study of the progression of explosives would provide the best data. *Education*, pp. 341–2; see also *Cater*, p. 533; *Letters* II, p. 616.

Projection became possible the moment he was struck by two things: the critical breaks between periods came ever closer together and, in every new period, human energy had increasingly dissipated. This led him to conclude (1) that the dates of equilibrium change are set by a law of acceleration, specifically the law of inverse squares, and (2) that social and intellectual energy is in an ever-accelerating state of disintegration and leveling out—not in fine gradations but in jumps. It was the law of inverse squares which led him to extrapolate, and talk about, an ethereal period. If the base period were really correct, the ethereal one, as he called it, would last from 1917 to 1921, the year in which man, unable to hold off the force of nature, would finally lose control. As the Virgin was the symbol for the age of religious fetishism, as the dynamo was the symbol for that of electricity, so radium symbolized this last phase of man. Its ethereal nature made discussion of it necessarily vague, though Adams was never inhibited about characterizing a present which implied a future:

> The play of thought for thought's sake had mostly ceased. The throb of fifty or a hundred million steam horse-power, doubling every ten years, and already more despotic than all the horses that ever lived, and all the riders they ever carried, drowned rhyme and reason. No one was to blame, for all were equally servants of the power, and worked merely to increase it. . . .
>
> Modern politics, is, at bottom, a struggle not of men but of forces. The men become every year more and more creatures of force, massed about central power-houses. The conflict is no longer between the men, but between the motors that drive the men, and the men tend to succumb to their own motive forces.
>
> Power leaped from every atom, and enough of it to supply the stellar universe showed itself running to waste at every pore of matter. Man could no longer hold it off. Forces grasped his wrists and flung him about as though he had hold of a live wire or a runaway automobile. . . .

These things he wrote in the *Education*. But already three years before he had told his brother Brooks that it was his belief "that science is to wreck us, and that we are like monkeys monkeying with a loaded shell. . . . It is mathematically certain to me that another thirty years of energy-development at the rate of the last century, must reach an *impasse*."[18]

The conclusions of the physical sciences of Adams' day proved to be all too easy to use for support and extension of his own insight. Adams welcomed Lord Kelvin's second law of thermodynamics less as scientific hypothesis than as final truth. Here was an authoritative, handy formulation stating the universality of entropy. The fact that man, like nature, would come to a dead end, both being subject to the same law, Adams was wholly ready to accept, solicitously noting that man, whose mass was strikingly less great than nature's, would meet annihilation first.

---

[18] *Education*, pp. 408, 421–2, 494; *Cater*, p. 529. See also his letters in Worthington Chauncey Ford, ed., *A Cycle of Adams Letters: 1861–1865*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1920, hereafter cited as *Cycle*), Vol. I, p. 135, and *Cater*, p. 504.

In responding to this formula uncritically, he surely betrayed his temper.[19] Yet an inner check kept the betrayal from being complete. However dogmatic he could sound when making predictions, with whatever exactitude and certainty he might make his repeated announcements of impending catastrophe, he actually accepted no law of physics as conclusive. He never quit the great debate, never let up reviewing the literature of science. On the contrary, he doggedly continued his search for "a spool on which to wind the thread of history without breaking it," his search for some object which was more than mere plaything, hypothesis, or force among forces.

> To the tired student, the idea that he must give it up seemed sheer senility. As long as he could whisper, he would go on as he had begun, bluntly refusing to meet his creator with the admission that the creation had taught him nothing except that the square of the hypotenuse of a right-angled triangle might for convenience be taken as equal to something else.

Knowing his own theory provided no answer—that his answers were not generated by his science—he kept raising his question of what might account for man's behavior, of what might give it meaning. And for Adams, there was to be no conclusive victory over the facts of history. While the extent of his discernment has been remarkable enough to all students of his work, the world did remain mysterious, irreducible to any set of symbols. Order might be the dream of man, but chaos persisted as the law of nature. The sequence of history, of society, of men, had led to nothing; the relation of cause and effect was artificial; the sequence of thought was unintelligible. There was to be no formula. Adams laid claim to no meaning. He offered no conclusion, either to philosopher or ruler.

> . . . in the chaotic and unintelligible condition in which I found—and left—the field of knowledge which is called History, I became overpoweringly conscious that any further pretence on my part of acting as instructor would be something worse than humbug. . . . As History stands, it is a sort of Chinese Play, without end and without lesson.

History remained "a tangled skein that one may take up at any point, and break when one has unravelled enough. . . . " The historian, it turned out, was purely arbitrary. What end or purpose might be discerned in history, the historian had supplied it. History, beyond all appearance, had no goal or purpose. All Adams could see, at the end, was endless flux and change—no necessary development.[20]

Ultimate reality was to him nothing but motion, nothing but force and its intensity.[21] Consequently no perceived particulars could be related to anything but one another—a conclusion which even physical science was compelled to reach.[22] If motion is all, if everything is relative, there can be no durable truth—and Adams knew it: "when he came to ask himself what he truly thought, he felt he had no Faith. . . . " For a while, he said, he believed in the truth of Darwinism. But he was certain "that whenever the next new hobby should be brought out, he should surely drop off from Darwinism like a monkey from a perch. . . . "[23] He knew "that the idea of one Form, Law, Order, or Sequence had no more value for him than the idea of none; that what he valued most was Motion, and what attracted his mind was Change." And he added that he "was the first in an infinite series to discover and admit to himself that he really did not care whether truth was, or was not, true." In the absence of truth, there could be no success, for there would be nothing to measure it by. In the absence of any point of orientation, there could only be the aimless pursuit—"the pursuit of ignorance in silence" which had "led the weary pilgrim into such mountains of ignorance that he could no longer see any path whatever, and could not even understand a signpost."[24] There was, indeed, no ground for support, no point from which to survey self or world. One might search for a reliable order, but Adams had foreknowledge of the necessary defeat.

---

[19] He seems to have known as much. In 1891 he wrote to Elizabeth Cameron, "Unfortunately I am cursed with the misfortune of thinking that I know beforehand what the result must be. . . . " (*Letters*, I, p. 458). And in 1910 he ironically wrote his brother Charles that he had provided "the logical and mathematical demonstration that the human race is going to end when I do. . . . " (*Letters* II, p. 551.)

[20] *Education*, pp. 302, 382, 451, 472, *Letters* II, p. 119 (see also *Education*, pp. 303, 306, 353).

[21] *Education*, p. 282; "Rule," p. 310.

II

To support Henry Adams' intellectual position, truly to embrace it, is to block all alternatives, to absolute, intensely personal despair. To believe, without compromise, without qualification, (1) that, in the final analysis, everything about man, about society, about history, about the universe itself, everything which man himself has not fabricated, is totally mysterious, (2) that, again in the final analysis, there is no point to anything, that nothing has intrinsic significance, that nothing is coherent except that which man himself has forced to cohere, (3) that man is but a force—a self-generating, self-activating, self-replenishing one—in a universe of forces, that all is ultimately force, and (4) that no particular event, no discrete thing, is autonomous but, when truly understood, related to some substructure of forces—to value and act on this combination of propositions is to permit the human enterprise to become literally unbearable.

The despair of this position has always invited attempts to bear up by removing the conflict between the self and the environment, to gain direct, immediate knowledge of the nature of things, to dispense with the ambiguities of all forms of mediation—basically those of language. It is revealing to note to what extent Adams himself edged toward the various forms assumed by man's desperate effort to reach spiritual truth directly, to bridge the gap between the self and the universe. Thus he significantly played with self-annihilation, making overtures to both total quietism and unreserved activism.

---

[22] *Ibid.*, pp. 227–8, 434.

[23] *Ibid.*, pp. 231–2. He concludes, not surprisingly, that "he was a Darwinian for fun." See also *Cater*, p. 648.

[24] *Education*, pp. 328, 433.

Those who have covered Adams' trail, his friends, critics, and biographers, have unearthed no record whatever of suicidal thoughts he might have entertained. But his abiding "hunger for annihilation," his conscientious effort to deny himself, has been fully evident. "I have deliberately and systematically effaced myself," he wrote Brooks in 1895, "even in my own history." He managed to keep himself concealed again and again—publishing anonymously, resisting every portrait photographer, unwilling "to talk or write or appear," refusing to address the American Historical Association, turning away from the honorary degree Harvard offered to bestow upon him, contriving to objectify himself by keeping the first person singular out of the account of his life.[25]

His same inability to come to terms with himself, his same inability to see the self as essentially and ultimately meaningful, found expression in an approval of a straightforward activism which makes it perfectly explicable that Adams conceived of mindless selfishness as "the only spring of success," and confessed, "I like best Bergson's frank surrender to the superiority of Instinct over Intellect. You know how I have preached that principle, and how I have studied the facts of it. In fact I wrote once a whole volume . . . in order to recall how Education may be shown to consist in following the intuitions of instinct."[26] It was in one of the most impressive passages of this volume that Adams paid his respect to the education of his grandfather. On one summer morning, he recalled, the old President had done with unreasoning, silent display of authority what, of necessity, *had* to be done—taken the rebellious Henry to school, and "without a word."[27] This inclination, an admittedly permanent one, to appreciate that silent strength and mastery which needs no apologetic other than its massive effectiveness, which justifies itself by virtue of its sheer potency, is a natural enough conclusion from Adams' premises. Assuming that none of the particular things within human experience can have meaning, he might nonetheless have conceived of the undifferentiated whole as meaningful. But to accept as meaningful only the universe in its awful entirety is to deprive oneself of any ground for making distinctions and discriminations, for caring about parts and articulations. Knowledge of such a universe must remain inexpressible, beyond symbolization, language, discourse. It is not surprising, therefore, that if reflection on the universe as well as on history is not enough to teach man anything—permitting him only to make what he will or to enjoy his nonsensical tautologies—all he can do, if act he must, is to act without reflection, without thought. While thoughtful action may still seem possible in the absence of a meaningful cosmos, it must lack a basis beyond the subjectivity of individuals, becoming altogether optional. Dependent on utility and efficiency, thought must appear either as a variety of action, as mere instrument for domination, or else as wasteful check on action and expansiveness.

---

[25] *Cater*, pp. xlvi, 36, 328, 519, 596, 647, 770; *Letters* II, pp. 8, 10–11, 70. To the editor's preface of the *Education*, actually written by Adams, he obtained permission to attach Henry Cabot Lodge's name. (*Cater*, pp. xc, 523.)

[26] *Cater*, p. 520; *Letters* II, p. 524.

[27] *Education*, pp. 12–13. For a possibly contrasting view of "men who sprang from the soil to power," see p. 265.

It is in one of Adams' poems, "Buddha and Brahma,"[28] that he goes the mystic's complete circle from uninhibited, spontaneous activism to acceptance and quietism. Just as he had asked himself about the terminus of history, so in this poem the Buddha is asked whether the world is eternal. Responding, but making no sound,

> The Buddha raised the Lotus in his hand,
> His eyes bent downward fixed upon the flower.
> No more!

To the son of the Rajah of Mogadha, an active ruler and warrior, this mysterious gesture begs for interpretation. He asks his father to explain. But the Rajah refuses, urging his son, "*Think not! Strike!*" He adds that all his "wisdom lies in these three words." Having been pressed to give the gesture meaning, the Rajah finally affirms:

> The Universal has no limit. Thought
> Travelling in constant circles, round and round,
> Must ever pass through endless contradictions,
> Returning on itself at last, till lost
> In silence.

And it is again on this note that the poem concludes:

> Life, Time, Space, Thought, the World, the Universe
> End where they first begin, in one sole Thought
> Of Purity in Silence.

Whatever law there might be, whatever the answer to Adams' question, it defies denotation and symbolization. Whatever unifying principles may exist, whatever constitution there is for man and society, it is beyond human articulation. The keenest exercise of the intellect and the most refined apprehensions of the sensibilities can teach man nothing but the wisdom of silence. Writing to Mabel La Farge in 1898, Adams professed that

> if I had a commission from the Infinite to concentrate all practical wisdom in the most condensed form of dying advice to my fellow beings, I should without a moment's hesitation say to Infinite Wisdom: "Hold your tongue and mind your own business!"

When reason is useless, when thought merely travels "round and round," when certain knowledge is ever contradicted, one is driven to the "study of . . . ignorance in silence," revering St. Francis' way of repudiating "the thread spun by the human spider" as "the most satisfactory—or sufficient—ever offered." When all relations between facts are hypothetical, nothing can be affirmed with certainty: "The student had nothing to say. For him, all opinion founded on fact must be error, because the facts can never be complete, and their relations must be always infinite." Realizing "he could teach his students nothing" —that is, nothing truly educating them—"the greatest good he could do them was to hold his tongue." There being no final science of history, it became necessary to stress, as Adams did, that "silence next to good temper was the mark of sense." "The situation seems to call for no opinion," he wrote in "The Tendency of History," "unless we have some scientific theory to offer. . . ." Either a finished theory—or nothing.[29]

---

[28] *Yale Review*, Vol. 5, pp. 82–9 (October 1915).

III

This existentialist, puritanical strain—one which makes all talk of God turn into blasphemy—is profoundly anti-humanistic. In being silent, man inescapably voids all expression, all discourse, fabrication, and art. Yet Adams' life and works contradict precisely such anti-humanism. If Adams mystically sought self-annihilation, spontaneous activism, or total quietism—if indeed he approached the mystic's conclusive solution of a conflict which, unresolved, drives man to despair—he always stopped short of actually embracing it. It is fascinating, in fact, to watch Adams move toward the mystic's final coordination—and to see him shrink back. Thus from Ceylon he banteringly wrote that he had gone "to the sacred bo-tree, which is now only a sick shoot or two from the original trunk, and under it I sat for half an hour, hoping to attain Nirvana. . . . I left the bo-tree without attaining Buddhaship."[30] Never giving up the various forms of expression, he compromised his mysticism. Consistently, if wistfully, he nullified the basis for his attempt to strike through paradoxes to some inexpressible holy synthesis. His self-depreciation was never quite complete.[30a] His quietism was as constantly restrained as his activism. His pursuit of ignorance in silence was after all what he had reluctantly called it: his "final *profession*."[31] He had always fully responded to the example provided by Henry James in a letter he addressed to Adams in 1914:

> *Of course* we are lone survivors, of course the past that was our lives is at the bottom of an abyss—if the abyss *has* any bottom; of course, too, there's no use talking unless one particularly *wants* to. But . . . one *can*, strange to say, still want to—or at least can behave as if one did. Behold me therefore so behaving—and apparently capable of continuing to do so. I still find my consciousness interesting—under *cultivation* of the interest. Cultivate it *with* me, dear Henry. . . . You see I still, in presence of life (or of what you deny to be such,) have reactions—as many as possible—and the book I sent you is a proof of them. It's, I suppose, because I am that queer monster, the artist, an obstinate finality, an inexhaustible sensibility. Hence the reactions—appearances, memories, many things, go on playing upon it with consequences that I note. . . .[32]

Undeniably, Adams did act on the suggestion that, although the world is black, although all is pointless, one can yet want to go on, keep talking, cultivate interests, react, and take note. While he was certain that there were no certainties, that therefore all was absurd, he not only kept on looking, for he was an insatiable traveler, but also kept on professing, articulating, writing. He never ceased taking part in the perennial human debate and thus never completed his alienation from society, hanging on as its diffident participant while ever departing from it.[33]

---

[29] *Cater*, p. 434; *Education*, pp. viii, 306, 310, 367–9 and 501; Henry Adams, *Mont-Saint-Michel and Chartres* (New York, 1904), ch. 15; *Letters* II, p. 119; "Tendency," p. 133. The counsel of silence pervades Adams' writings: see also *Letters* I, p. 301; *Letters* II, pp. 70, 122–3, 317, 445, 468, 552; *Cater*, pp. 235–358, 475, 496, 519, 521, 524; *Education*, p. 358.

[30] *Letters* I, p. 526. His relation to Catholicism may be similarly characterized; see Jordy, *op. cit.*, p. 286, n. 90.

[30a] See *Education*, pp. 305, 462.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 369; emphasis supplied.

[32] Percy Lubbock, ed., *The Letters of Henry James*, Vol. II, pp. 360–1 (New York, 1920).

This unresolved tension between engagement and disengagement persisted. To maintain it, Adams invariably avoided giving his convictions secular power. He consequently communicated no sense of commitment to any dogma, remaining exasperatingly fuzzy and inconclusive to every generation of readers of the *Education*. He notably failed to *argue* any position to its terminus, aware that in an America enjoying its gilded age no opponents could be enlisted in systematic debate.[34] There was, he lamented, no audience: "No one cares." In an America pervaded, as Louis Hartz has shown, by an irritatingly effective, all-corrosive liberalism, Adams was unable to come to the point and challenge the national creed head-on.[35] It was his very indirectness, supported by the doctrine that there were no certainties, that kept him from feeling free either to create his own truth or, by a shock of recognition, to intuit some specific truth immanent in history. Thus he rejected the Nietzschean view that the artist-historian should impose on his material and simply fabricate his myth no less than the Hegelian one that History is permeated by Spirit moving in a determinable way. He never arbitrarily filled the nothing he encountered: he patented no Dialectic, identified no True Leader, held no brief for Reason manifest, designated no Elite, Party, or Race.[36] That he institutionalized no insight, translated no transcendental truth into secular reality, imposed no law of science, is worth emphasizing for it distinguishes his effort from historicism such as that of Marx and Engels. Whatever law there seemed to be, whatever science appeared to be true, for Adams it required infinite qualification. Thus he found it easy to call his "Rule of Phase" his last plaything, "not meant to be taken too seriously"; he noted he was a Darwinian "for fun"; he regarded his "Letter to American Teachers of History" as a "fable," as a "form of humor." And by holding that the relation between facts must be always infinite, he put every relation between facts, every correlation, in doubt —making all statements equivocal, leaving all histories ambiguous, inverting every formulation until it affirmed its opposite, and then denying that too. His assertion that "no one means all he says, and yet very few say all they mean, for words are slippery and thought is viscous" can well stand as his final disclaimer.[37]

---

[33] Even where he might be tempted to rationalize his failure, he admits his desire for power (*Education*, pp. 263, 358–9). In 1862, he wrote to Charles Adams, "But what we want is a *school*. We want a national set of young men like ourselves or better, to start new influences not only in politics, but in literature, in law, in society, and throughout the whole social organism of the country—a national school of our own generation." *Cycle* I, p. 196. The *Education* and the "Letter," too, were intended "to serve a social purpose," *Cater*, p. 781; *Letters* II, p. 524; see also Jordy, *op. cit.*, pp. 250–5.

[34] How hard Adams tried may be seen in his review of Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology* where, as he confessed later, "he resorted to what he thought the bold experiment of inserting a sentence in the text, intended to provoke correction." (*Education*, p. 227.)

[35] *Cater*, p. 621; see also pp. 330, 644–5, and his letter to Henry Holt, p. 455. To Henry James, Adams wrote in 1903, "We knew nothing—no! but really nothing! of the world. One cannot exaggerate the profundity of ignorance of Story in becoming a sculptor, or Sumner in becoming a statesman, or Emerson in becoming a philospher. Story and Sumner, Emerson and Alcott, Lowell and Longfellow, Hillard, Winthrop, Motley, Prescott, and all the rest, were the same mind,—and so, poor worm!— was I! . . . Improvised Europeans, we were, and—Lord God!— how thin!" (*Letters*, II, p. 414.)

[36] This is not to deny his doctrinaire economic notions or his ingenuous anti-Semitism.

To see Adams employ this process of integrating ambiguities is to see the artist at work. The artist can provide a dimension for understanding politics and society whenever he disciplines his implacable urge to negate the world, whenever he harnesses the impulse which makes him shatter, as André Malraux has argued, the forms he has inherited. In qualifying and requalifying whatever did find expression, whatever did become manifest, Adams expressed himself ironically, elliptically, artistically. It is as artist that he used symbols pointing at both the obvious and the concealed. By plausibly relating the concealed to the obvious, he denied what is affirmed, cancelled what is credited. He thus helped make the unbelievable believable, the impertinent pertinent, the unconventional conventional. To carry this off, the artist must be playful.[38] He must be entertainingly, dramatically serious in order to lead man into the dark caverns of experience—caverns he lights up, illuminating what without the light touch would be unbearable. And yet he will keep men from embracing and fighting for the very truth he has revealed, committed as he is to mock that too. At his finest, which is also at his most anti-social, he cannot help but reveal that whatever implausibility his exploration has made plausible it too is streaked and freakish, not to be taken in earnest, something already too comfortable to justify human discomfort, too domestic to merit sacrifice.

The result of the artist's elliptical method—if it is successful—is to provide a fuller view of any specific situation, to broaden perceptions, enhance imaginative sympathies, heighten and refine consciousness. The capacity for this Adams himself discerned in the artist John La Farge:

> Of all his friends La Farge alone owned a mind complex enough to contrast against the commonplaces of American uniformity. . . . The American mind—the Bostonian as well as the Southern or Western—likes to walk straight up to its object, and assert or deny something that it takes for a fact; it has a conventional approach, a conventional analysis, and a conventional conclusion, as well as a conventional expression, all the time loudly asserting its unconventionality. The most disconcerting trait of John La Farge was his reversal of the process. His approach was quiet and indirect; he moved round an object, and never separated it from its surroundings. . . . One was never quite sure of his whole

---

[37] *Letters* II, p. 515, n. 1; *Education*, p. 352 (see *Cater*, p. 682); *Letters* II, pp. 524, 531; *Education*, pp. 410, 451.

[38] Thus Adams thought Raymond Poincaré's "artistic measure" was precisely his "light touch." *Education*, p. 455. " 'Discuss serious things lightly and light things seriously,' was one of his rules of good conduct. . . . " *Cater*, p. lxvii. See also his letter to George Cabot Lodge, *Cater*, pp. 540–3.

meaning until too late to respond, for he had no difficulty in carrying different shades of contradiction in his mind.[39]

Keeping contradictions in suspense, the artist projects possibilities which it is unconventional to consider. Taking stock for individuals too absorbed in their immediate environment, too captivated by present urgencies, the artist will expose their usual business and politics as incomplete ventures, as meager preoccupations, as flat and stale and unpromising. Developing new analogies and utopias, he may detect riches men fail to appreciate. And pointing to the concrete sources of vitality and impotence which tend to escape extremists—activists too much in touch and quietists too much out of touch—he may not only emancipate men from the dictates of the past but also provide a basis for mediation and reconciliation. Sensitive to continuities he may chasten those who are merely expansive and fitful. He may make it possible for men to reorder and stabilize their existence, in the words of Herbert J. Muller,[40] "by systematically complicating all issues, stressing the defects and the excesses of all values, insisting on tension, imbalance, uncertainty, and contradiction . . . by ironically qualifying the great triumphs and reverently qualifying the great failures. . . . "

To do this is to deprive any particular era or generation of its balance and success. By proclaiming himself to be a failure—by so labelling all of his impressive achievements—Adams outwitted expectations and implied that no one had really encountered success, that his contemporaries were far from triumphant, that it was rash to consider the time of his lifespan as one of equilibrium and fulfillment for American politics and statesmanship. In placing in a wider context the manners and formulas of an America which had yet to come of age, he perceived characteristics to which his compatriots were blind. He saw complexities where others saw simplicities, challenging the prevailing definition of practicality and efficiency, the formula of progress, the belief in inevitable victory, the faith in the necessary destiny of American democracy.

By creating the complicating perspectives which placed American experience in a new light, by establishing new relationships, Adams redeemed a scientific failure which was unmitigated and genuine. For he offered a statement—given actuality in the very way he shaped his life—which is at once elegant and humanistic. Seemingly denying everything, he still affirmed good form—including a deep responsibility to the integrity of the philosophical and scholarly quest. In implying that if men must waste their resources and fail it is imperative that they do so with dignity, he reveals his values—values which the assumptions of his science had to discredit. His immense "failure"—and now the word must be put in quotes—is significant: for he was successfully sustained not by his scientific conclusions but by his artistic commitment. Indeed, he fought heroically: recognizing the necessity of defeat he remained intellectually upright, unhumiliated by nature.[41] Yet it is obvious that the way Adams redeemed his failure as scientist could not lead him to the only education, the only success, he valued—success in formulating a model for comprehending society, in making society the subject of law.

---

[39] *Education*, pp. 369–70.

[40] *The Uses of the Past* (New York, 1952), p. 24. Muller is discussing not the task of the artist but the tragic view of history.

IV

Whether the task is to affect historical events or to gain understanding of them, Adams offered two methods, one by explicit statement, the other by the way he himself proceeded. Events may be dealt with either by the physicist-historian or else by the artist, either by those who master the forces of society or those for whom every view, every conclusion, is too provincial, too specific, too narrow. Characteristically, Adams jeopardized the validity of both methods. Thus he had held not only that scientific, positive history led to nothing but also that art, as a critical, negativist enterprise, had its limits no less: "The mania for handling all the sides of every question, looking into every window, and opening every door, was, as Bluebeard judiciously pointed out to his wives, fatal to their practical usefulness in society."[42] Yet Adams never followed up his doubt. He never openly stated that neither of his alternative approaches makes it possible to deal with the events of this world in a reasonable manner, that is, by persuading men in terms of a rationally held and defended standard, one which is on the one hand admittedly less final than a Law of History but on the other immune to the irresponsible relativism implicit in the artistic method, a standard exposed to the impact of debate but beyond the endless mockery of irony. Only by acknowledging the relevance of such standards, of such political theory, is it possible (1) to conceive of "an eternity of Grants, or even of Garfields or Conklins or Jay Goulds" and, more importantly, (2) to deal with them by political, non-violent means. In the face of every imperfect, chaotic array of politicians, in the face of the innumerable gradations of human error, Adams counseled either control of conflicting social forces in terms of a determinate, absolute law or else suspension of all articulation. Thus it was easy for him to write, for example, that he saw "no hope for the government [the McKinley Administration] short of sweeping it out of existence."[43] Man had to impose forcefully upon politics or else decline to take it seriously.

The temptation, some fifty years after Adams' prime, to accept as well as act on the dilemma he posed, to treat his alternative roads to truth as the *only* valid ones, has certainly been strong. His way of obtaining education might therefore help shed light on the possibilities of that flourishing modern social science which, like Adams', is motivated by the desire to find theoretical models for a social universe lacking in intrinsic meaning, and which reaches out to order the accidents of history, to master the variables of behavior. This motive and goal pervade present-day research precisely to the extent that it assumes that all sequences of events and all allocations of resources are fundamentally arbitrary and artificial, that all norms, standards, or values are formed by man to serve his needs or escape his secular predicaments, and that the *de facto* universe is devoid of purpose and meaning.

---

[41] One of the characters in *Democracy*, cast as a successful Massachusetts historian but an ineffectual diplomat, is made to say, "Let us be true to our time . . . ! If our age is to be beaten, let us die in the ranks. If it is to be victorious let us be the first to lead the column. Anyway, let us not be skulkers or grumblers." Since the speaker is a pessimist and cynic, this view is made all the more arresting. See also *Cater*, p. 449.

[42] *Education*, p. 232. In 1862 he had already written that a mind to which "evil never seems unmixed with good" and to which "good is always streaked with evil . . . a mind which is not strongly positive and absolute, cannot be steadily successful in action. . . ." *Cycle* I, p. 195.

[43] *Cater*, p. 458; see also *Letters* II, p. 100.

In a universe wholly free of imperatives, devoid of meaning, lawless in its very essence, social scientists may experience an exhilarating sense of liberation —not, of course, liberation from the formidable institutional and organizational pressures of society, but from restrictive theory. In such a universe, social science is free to impute norms, standards, or values.[44] It proceeds by modestly offering its imputations as hypothetically posited conceptual systems. "More and more," one sympathetic student of the work of social scientists has concluded

> their self-conscious ambition is the same as that of the natural scientists, to create a set of highly determinate theories for the explanation of empirical social phenomena. Increasingly they are learning the significance and functions of abstract and systematic conceptual schemes.[45]

These schemes, it is hoped, will provide reliable scientific knowledge—the kind justifying unreserved commitment, the only kind which Adams would have credited with the value of education. They will tie the random forces of history together. Composed of the neutral terms that relate variables, they will constructively furnish unambiguous inferential links among the multiplicity of experienced facts, among the mass of historical data. Created free from a politics of compromise, free from the presuppositions of such politics, they will constitute a unified, artificial order of unequivocal connecting terms. Ideally, they will be a social constitution, but one purged of the subjectivism, the ambiguity, the variability of constitutions men have framed so far. They will not satisfy the conditions of an objective, positive, natural science of society as long as subjective, emotional, value-laden terms remain unreduced. Hence all language tainted by values must be eliminated. Vague standards must be converted into precise indices, into frameworks or constitutions capable of assuming abstract, mathematical form.[46] At their best, social scientists must design a thoroughly refined notational order untarnished by emotive blots, moral considerations, subjectively felt data, and historical bias.

---

[44] Adams was to recall that he had "sat down as though he were again a boy at school to shape *after his own needs* the values of a Dynamic Theory of History." In order "to become effective" he had "to invent a formula *of his own* for his own universe. . . . " (*Education*, pp. 472–3; emphasis supplied.)

[45] Bernard Barber, *Science and the Social Order* (Glencoe, Ill., 1952), p. 244. The following treatises might be mentioned: Stuart C. Dodd, *Dimensions of Society: A Quantitative Systematics for the Social Sciences* (1942); Herbert A. Simon, *Adminstrative Behavior* (1948); George C. Homans, *The Human Group* (1950); Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, *Power and Society: A Framework for Political Inquiry* (1950); Nicolas Rashevsky, *Mathematical Biology of Social Behavior* (1951); Talcott Parsons, *The Social System* (1951); Marion J. Levy, Jr., *The Structure of Society* (1952); Roy R. Grinker, ed., *Toward a Unified Theory of Human Behavior* (1956); see also *Behavioral Science*, a journal which began publication in 1956.

This order will not be conditioned or checked by the changeable, variable factors of human history. As an absolute, it will be radically unhistorical, compressing past and future into a timeless frame. It will be a perfect accounting system, exhaustively taking care of all contingencies, dissolving all novelties and peculiarities by revealing them to be parts of harmonious universals. When suitably embraced, what appears as incongruous and paradoxical will disclose itself as congruent and unified. Once established and refined, a full set of generalizations, losing its hypothetical character, will fully establish the real organization of the facts of social life. Structured by an objectively valid theory, the social continuum, no different from the natural one, will be understood. Thus it should be possible, in principle, for the social scientist to know in terms of what rational structure to arrange society, control every baffling idiosyncrasy, integrate every deviant.

It is Adams' work, the way he had sought education, which can make clear both the activism and the elitism this approach must imply. A social or historical science resolving to become positive by operating on the epistemological premise of the physical sciences, admitting as final knowledge only what has been tested by an artificial, non-natural operation, and treating everything else, including its assumptions, as merely hypothetical, probable, or variable—such a science is compelled by its logic to resort to testing, to setting up operations, to be productive and get results. It must be engaged in experimentation to obtain knowledge, for it considers only that true which it has constructed, manipulated, put to the test.[47] Indifferent toward the limits of history and the standards which transcend it—provoked by all manifestations of freedom and prepared to reduce them—such a science must seek to grasp variables in practice, ordering them, pinning them down, bringing about what Adams called "the despotism of artificial order."[48] Thus its goal, admittedly far from realized, is to incarnate the trans-historical theory it posits, to translate, as Marx had envisaged, abstract philosophy into concrete action, to make the real blend with the ideal.[49]

It is no wonder that Adams was led to note the conflict between such a science and those who would defend their freedom,[50] that he confessed in a cryptic comment to have written his "Letter to American Teachers of History" to ask them "what they are going to do about socialism."[51] Moreover, he could scarcely have been pleased by the prospect of a control of social forces so total that men would find themselves living in a realm in which spontaneity and necessity were indistinguishable. If, however, he entertained doubts about all prospects, he must have doubted the inevitability of the potential triumph of social science. Yet the only basis for such doubt is the belief in the possibility of appealing to an incommensurable human quality, the faith in the continuing possibility of using language to educate and enlighten men, the expectation that they will tend to act rightly once they are made aware of what they do, once they are led to see the tension between the real and the ideal, once the artist has raised the implications of their actions to a level of consciousness which makes them feel uncomfortable and rebellious. Adams' resignation was never so complete as to cause him to repudiate this faith or shirk the work it demands. For he had emphatically seen it as his duty "to fit young men, in universities or elsewhere, to be men of the world, equipped for any emergency. . . ."[52] If despite all his digressions he ultimately clarified the failure of positivist science and negativist art to provide a sufficient grounding for dependable knowledge of man and society, he may have equipped the student better than he had reason to hope.

---

[46] As Adams discerned, "Ignorance required that these political and social and scientific values of the twelfth and twentieth centuries should be correlated in some relations of movement that could be expressed in mathematics . . . " (*Education*, p. 376). He frequently regretted his ignorance of mathematics; see, for example, *Letters* II, p. 519.

[47] See *Education*, pp. 458, 488.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 458.

[49] See Adams' letter to Taylor, cited in n. 13, above.

[50] "Tendency," pp. 128–9.

---

[51] Waldo G. Leland, quoted in *Cater*, p. xcv. See also *Letters* II, p. 537.

[52] *Education*, p. x.

J. ALLEN SMITH: JEFFERSONIAN CRITIC OF THE FEDERALIST STATE*

HOWARD E. DEAN
University of Oregon

It is a commonplace that every period rewrites history in the light of its own problems, and with the aid of wisdom after the event. Changes in the climate of opinion and shifts in the winds of doctrine naturally bring the contributions of earlier thinkers under new scrutiny. Today the mood of critical reassessment is strong, for a significant shift has taken place in English and American political opinion during the past decade; the temper of the times is not visionary, but revisionist, and the pull is not toward revolution, but toward revaluation. The spate of books and articles on the "new conservatism," the "new right," and the "conservative tradition," however, and if ever, defined;[1] the reconsiderations of liberal and reformist thought;[2] the succession of Michael Oakeshott to the chair of Harold J. Laski; the recantations of repentant liberals, and the curious spectacle of revolutionaries triumphantly in reverse; the vogue of Burke and De Tocqueville; and even the difference between D. W. Brogan's earlier acid etching of the American political scene and his recent essay in contentment,[3] all make clear in their varying ways that times have changed.

Louis Hartz has recently said that, "in American social studies we still live in the shadow of the Progressive era."[4] The political and social thinkers who laid the intellectual foundations of Progressivism have long enjoyed the flattery of imitation; surely they also deserve the tribute of reappraisal. It would be churlish, while still standing on their shoulders, smugly to proclaim their feet of clay. But to scan the horizons today we need a different footing. Certainly J. Allen Smith, whose political ideas are the subject of this essay, would wish us to avoid the error of Hway: "*Hway,* said Confucius, *is of no assistance to me; there is nothing that I say in which he does not delight.*"[5]

One of the most vigorous and incisive voices of the Progressive era, J. Allen Smith was a lawyer who found the ministry of municipal litigation and village vexation[6] too confining, took a doctorate in economics at the University of Michigan in 1894, and then set forth on an academic career. But the blade of his mind cut too sharply across the grooves of academe, and he was dropped from his first brief post: "the hornets are quick with their stings if the nest of privilege is disturbed."[7] Thenceforth he carried out his "exposition of the gentle art of thwarting the majority will by legal and constitutional means"[8] at the University of Washington where he was professor of political science from 1897 until his death in 1924, a span of years which marked the rise and decline of the Progressive movement.[9] A fearless and stimulating teacher, he was a respecter neither of prescriptive privilege nor of stuffed shirts. He called a spade a spade, he called the Constitution of the United States a reactionary document, and he is now perhaps best remembered as a main forerunner of Beard's economic interpretation.[10] His ideas influenced Theodore Roosevelt, William Allen White, Robert M. La Follette, and many other Progressive leaders. Although his fame today is faded, Parrington's great study dedicated to his memory, "scholar, teacher, democrat, gentleman, he was the friend of all who love justice,"[11] is a monumental reminder of his name. In the late 1930's Odegard and Helms inscribed their book on American politics to his memory,[12] and American government students still make his acquaintance in Christensen and

---

* This article is a revision of a paper read at the Pacific Northwest Political Science Association meeting at Moscow, Idaho, April 1955.

[1] *The New American Right,* ed. Daniel Bell (New York, 1955); Russell Kirk, *The Conservative Mind* (Chicago, 1953); Clinton L. Rossiter, *Conservatism in America* (New York, 1955).

[2] Eric F. Goldman, *Rendezvous with Destiny* (New York, 1952); Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America* (New York, 1955); Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform* (New York, 1955).

[3] D. W. Brogan, *Government of the People* (New York, 1933); *Politics in America* (New York, 1954).

[4] Hartz, *op. cit.,* p. 27. Professor Hartz suggests that Progressives like Beard, Smith, Parrington, Louis Boudin, and Gustavus Myers did not really grasp the America in which they lived (p. 237).

[5] Carl L. Becker, *Everyman His Own Historian* (New York, 1935), p. v.

---

[6] The phrase is Edmund Burke's. *Reflections on the French Revolution,* Everyman's Library edition (London, 1953), p. 40.

[7] Vernon L. Parrington, Introduction to J. Allen Smith, *The Growth and Decadence of Constitutional Government* (New York, 1930), p. xvi. Cited henceforth as *Growth.* Smith was dropped from the faculty of Marietta College ostensibly as a retrenchment measure, but a replacement was appointed: "apparently money was available if a suitable man was found." Arthur G. Beach, *A Pioneer College: The Story of Marietta* (Privately printed, 1935), p. 227.

[8] Parrington, *ibid.*

[9] For accounts of Smith's life and work see Eric F. Goldman, "J. Allen Smith: The Reformer and His Dilemma," *Pacific Northwest Quarterly,* Vol. 35, pp. 195–214 (July, 1944); Edward MacMahon, "James Allen Smith," *Dictionary of American Biography,* Vol. 17, pp. 286–87 (1935).

[10] Charles A. Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (New York, 1913). Joseph Dorfman has argued that Beard's book was not a documented vindication of Smith's interpretation, but, on the contrary, was partly an effort to meet Smith's charge that the Constitution was a "reactionary" document. *The Economic Mind in American Civilization* (New York, 1949), Vol. 3, pp. 348–49. In similar vein, Robert E. Thomas has emphasized that Beard had little patience with what he regarded as the imbecilities of the Articles of Confederation; that he had tremendous admiration for the Founding Fathers, was an opponent of Populist-Wilsonian ideas, and an ardent defender of judicial review. "A Reappraisal of Charles A. Beard's *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution,*" *American Historical Review,* Vol. 57, pp. 370–375 (January, 1952). As Thomas notes, chapter IV of Beard's *The Supreme Court and the Constitution* New York, 1912), entitled "The Spirit of the Constitution," is in marked contrast to Smith's evaluation of that spirit.

[11] Vernon L. Parrington, *Main Currents in American Thought,* 3 Vols. (New York, 1927–30).

[12] Peter H. Odegard and E. Allen Helms, *American Politics* (New York, 1938).

Kirkpatrick's widely used anthology.[13] In 1948 Harold J. Laski wrote lovingly and extravagantly that, of American political scientists since 1900, only the work of those like J. Allen Smith was seriously relevant to contemporary America.[14]

Permanently interesting as part of the literature of social criticism in America, as a fresh and penetrating voice at a time when constitutional studies often seemed "formal and devout and lifeless and dull,"[15] Smith is even more significant as revealing the tensions in Progressive thought. The magnitude of those tensions, the conflicting values, the pull of contradictory forces, the deep ambivalence, is suggested by contrasting Herbert Croly's ideal of a benevolent, neo-Federalist, centralized, reforming state with Brandeis's urgent warnings of "the curse of bigness," or by setting Roosevelt's "New Nationalism" alongside Wilson's "New Freedom."[16] The problems of the past do not necessarily die with it: recent controversies over roads to serfdom or roads to reaction are in a real sense the current versions of the perplexities which plagued Progressive minds. Smith's thought strikingly suggests the difficulty and danger both of seeking to attain Jeffersonian ends by Hamiltonian means, and of using Jeffersonian means to fashion a hook for Leviathan.

I

The simple, forceful, audacious theme of Smith's famous first book, which appeared in 1907,[17] was that the spirit of American government is the reactionary, undemocratic spirit of the propertied classes frustrating the will of the masses. Generally regarded as the democratic ark of the covenant, the Constitution was in bitter fact the conspiratorial product of the Thermidorean reaction of 1787 which snuffed out the democracy of the Revolutionary period. In the Constitution property rights and minority interests were hedged about with a system of checks and balances irreconcilable with popular government. Nearly impossible to amend, clogging and baffling the popular will, embracing a spurious federalism which only thinly masked national supremacy, guarded by an oligarchic judiciary, the Constitution was an instrument which defeated the true end of government: "the unhampered expression and prompt enforcement of public opinion."[18] Smith sought to unmask the democratic pretensions of the Constitution, to show that "things are seldom what they seem," although curiously enough for so devoted a champion of the popular will, he never bothered to explain away the gullibility of a people so artfully bamboozled for more than a century.[19]

---

[13] A. N. Christensen and E. M. Kirkpatrick, *The People, Politics, and the Politician*, rev. ed. (New York, 1950).

[14] Harold J. Laski, *The American Democracy* (New York, 1948), p. 749.

[15] Walton H. Hamilton, reviewing Smith's *Growth*, *Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 40, pp. 152–53 (November, 1930).

[16] Herbert Croly, *The Promise of American Life* (New York, 1909); Louis D. Brandeis, *The Curse of Bigness*, ed. Osmond K. Fraenkel (New York, 1934); Theodore Roosevelt, *The New Nationalism* (New York, 1910); Woodrow Wilson, *The New Freedom* (New York, 1913).

[17] *The Spirit of American Government* (New York, 1907). Cited henceforth as *Spirit*.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 305.

A "Reform Darwinian,"[20] Smith believed that the line of political progress lay in the evolution from unlimited and irresponsible government, through a stage of limited and irresponsible government, to the democratic level of unlimited and responsible government. His cherished image of democracy was one in which checks and balances were swept away and the people's will reigned supreme. Adverting to the early state constitutions as having approached this goal, he exhibited no Actonian misgivings about the problem of power:[21]

> In so far as government had now passed into the hands of the people there was no longer any reason to fear that it would encroach upon what they regarded as their rights.

Like many American political scientists,[22] Smith looked longingly at the disciplined, responsible, programmatic British party system whose American counterpart had been made impossible by the constitutional dispersion of power and responsibility.[23] Yet, unlike many present-day writers, he rejected the vision of the President as a latter-day popular tribune and charismatic oracle of the nation's real will.[24] Indeed, he regretted that the Framers had not intended the President to be "a mere administrative agent of Congress,"[25] and complained that they had bestowed upon him an independent obligation to defend the Constitution which was more binding than "his duty to enforce the laws enacted by Congress."[26]

Despite the claim that Smith "set in motion the economic interpretation"[27] of the Constitution, his essential concern was not with economic foundations, but with political institutions and theories, and his interpretation of politics was more political than economic. The political reforms he desired were chiefly the adoption of the direct democratic devices so confidently regarded at the turn of the century.[28] Although he warned reactionaries that continued frustration of the popular will might lead to a national constitutional convention, sweeping away the entire system of checks and balances, his main hope was for reform at the state and local level.[29] His proposals for reform did not go so deeply to the root of things as his reputation as a radical might suggest. Indeed, he pinned his faith largely upon devices which more radical social critics might have scorned as mere mechanical tinkering.

---

[19] Herbert Croly, in rejecting Smith's conspiracy theory of the Constitution, asked why the Jeffersonians had not undone the Federalist handiwork when they assumed power. His answer was that the political system was harmonious with the economic interests of the Jeffersonians. *Progressive Democracy* (New York, 1914), pp. 46–51.

[20] Goldman, *op. cit. supra* n. 2, at p. 146.

[21] *Spirit,* p. 293.

[22] See American Political Science Association Committee on Political Parties, "Toward a More Responsible Two-party System." Supplement to this REVIEW, Vol. 44 (September, 1950). Austin Ranney has suggested that the failure to develop such a system in the United States is not due to popular ignorance of the case for its virtues, but rather to the point emphasized by A. Lawrence Lowell, that "responsible and disciplined parties will appeal only to a people committed to the desirability of unlimited majority rule; and that the American people, far from believing in majority rule, are devoted to the preservation of minority rights *against* majority rule." *The Doctrine of Responsible Party Government* (Urbana, Ill., 1954), p. 160.

[23] *Spirit,* pp. 203–29.

[24] For an extreme example see William H. Riker, *Democracy in the United States* (New York, 1953), pp. 346–65.

[25] *Spirit,* p. 145.

[26] *Ibid.,* p. 146.

[27] William Seagle, "James Allen Smith," *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* Vol. 14, p. 116 (1935).

On the economic front, Smith opposed laissez-faire and socialism alike.[30] Believing in the regulative powers of competition, he argued that monopoly and concentration had stifled real competition, and urged a positive role for the state in controlling and organizing industrial forces. But save for the "gas and water" variety, he rejected socialism because of its rejection of the competitive principle as inherently vicious. Economically, his main hopes centered on the adoption of monetary reforms which he thought the key to the revival of competition.[31] He also proclaimed that democracy was the enemy of monopoly, that it demanded equality of opportunity and the equitable distribution of the product of industry. But he was never very clear as to the concrete measures necessary for achieving these goals, and it may be doubted whether monetary reforms were equal to the task. His later thought certainly suggests that he had been shaken by the dilemma suggested in Acton's epigram: "the passion for equality made vain the hope of freedom."[32]

---

[28] Smith, "Recent Institutional Legislation," *Proceedings of the American Political Science Association,* Fourth Annual Meeting, Vol. 4, pp. 141–51 (1908).

[29] *Spirit,* p. 347.

[30] See Dorfman, *loc. cit. supra* n. 10, at pp. 294–9.

[31] Smith, "The Multiple Money Standard," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* Vol. 7, pp. 173–232 (March, 1896).

[32] John Emerich Edward Dalberg-Acton, *The History of Freedom and Other Essays,* ed. John Neville Figgis and Reginald Vere Laurence (London, 1907), p. 57. Like Edward A. Ross, John R. Commons, and others in the Populist-Progressive tradition (see Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform,* pp. 8–9; 173–184), J. Allen Smith was quite hostile toward the tide of immigrants, and was particularly concerned with the need to restrict immigration from the Far East. In a paper presented to a meeting of the American Economic Association, "The Relation of Oriental Immigration to the General Immigration Problem," *Bulletin of the American Economic Association,* Fourth Series, Vol. I, No. 2, pp. 237–42 (April, 1911), Smith pointed to the contradiction in having a protective tariff alongside an open immigration policy which benefitted some employers by providing cheap labor and harmed the American laborer by depressing the standard of living. The furthering of the great purpose of America, the diffusion and preservation of a high level of general well-being, justified in Smith's view the exclusion of "undesirable" immigrants. His argument was largely economic, for he defined "undesirable immigrant" as one willing to work for less than the prevailing rate of wages (p. 242). But his position had a moral basis in addition, for he spoke of "low grade immigrants who lacked the initiative, the energy, and the means" (p. 238) to have come in prior to the exploitation of immigration as a regular business by the great steamship companies. The appearance of "the Chinese coolie, with his low standard of living and his patient endurance, was an undeniable meance to the well-being of the American laborer" (p. 239). The same might be said, Smith added, of much

Despite his angry sense of deeply entrenched privilege and plunder masked by piety and patriotism, Smith's first book was filled with an optimistic faith in progress which to our more chastened age seems almost pathetically naive. He believed that democracy would "raise government to the rank and dignity of a science,"[33] by making it appeal to the people's reason rather than to their fear and superstition: "we are at the threshold of a new social order under which the few will no longer rule the many."[34] One listens with uneasiness to this apocalyptic note which Smith sometimes struck, with its overtone of history redemptively nearing some terminus of righteousness where the unregenerate would be cast out and where in place of struggle and conflict, unanimity and new harmony would prevail:[35]

> We are witnessing and taking part in the final struggle between the old and the new—a struggle which will not end until one or the other of these irreconcilable theories of government is completely overthrown, and a new and harmonious political structure evolved.

It would be unfair to read too much into this, but in it lurks the suggestion, at least, of that final victory of the popular will which would mark the end of public policy based on the pressures of various and contending interests, the end of bargaining and negotiation, the end of compromise—the end, indeed, of politics. Fortunately this was a recessive strain in Smith's thought, for it bears the stigma of the saints of many profane eschatologies who readily imagine that conformity in the service of their mortal gods is perfect freedom: secular salvation has often been the goal of that politics of perfection which has borne such bitter witness to the evil that good men do. True believers who look for the motive forces of history conveniently "to commit hara-kiri on the doorstep of the ideal"[36] have never learned that in the grammar of politics there is no future perfect.

It is hard not to admire the courage, the faith, and the passion for justice which moved J. Allen Smith. But it is hard not to smile a bit wistfully at his vision of a new world heralded by the clarion voice of the People, calling in unison, knowing what it wants, how to get it, and hastening to the new Jerusalem by way of the initiative, referendum, recall, direct primary, popular election of Senators, and the "packing" of the Supreme Court. A gulf separates the Smith of 1907 from those more recent analysts of the spirit of American government, who, knowing revolution, dictatorship and total war, have concluded instead:[37]

---

of the immigration from Europe. Exclusion of Oriental immigrants, he explained, "does not necessarily imply a belief on our part that the Oriental races are inferior to our own, but that they are fundamentally different, and if they were admitted in considerable numbers, it would mean a race problem of serious import" (p. 238).

[33] *Spirit*, p. 386.

[34] *Ibid.*, p. 380.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 378.

[36] Becker, *op. cit. supra* n. 5, at p. 119.

[37] Herbert Agar, *The Price of Union* (Boston, 1950), pp. 690–91.

> The United States, of course, may some day attain such uniformity (or have it thrust upon her) that she will abandon her federal structure; but until that happens she will be governed by concurrent majorities, by vetoes and filibusters, by parties which take both sides of every dangerous question, which are held together by the amusements and rewards of office-seeking, and which can only win an election by bringing many incompatible groups to accept a token triumph in the name of unity, instead of demanding their full "rights" at the cost of a fight.
>
> The world today might do worse than study the curious methods by which such assuagements are effected.

II

The very title of Smith's last book, *The Growth and Decadence of Constitutional Government*[38] bespoke the disenchantment which came in the wake of the first world war. The mouths of Progressive prophets were stopped with bitter dust: "The war intervened," remarked Parrington, "and the green fields shriveled in an afternoon."[39] The pervasive theme of the book was the danger of centralized power, whether in the national government, in industry, or in that dangerous glimmering of a super-state called the League of Nations. The war and the political changes which accompanied it, wrote Smith, had convinced him "that extreme centralization of political power is one of the greatest dangers confronting this country today. . . . "[40]

Chagrined by the growth of the national patriotism which had supplanted loyalty to the states, Smith protested that the national government had been burdened with tasks for which it was ill suited. As its power swelled, the capacity of citizens to comprehend or control it steadily diminished.[41] His fear of centralization even brought him to disagreement with many liberal friends because of his deep opposition to the proposed federal child labor amendment and to the League of Nations:

> I am convinced that the only way to secure any real democracy in this country is to check the growth of federal power and to increase the freedom or initiative and authority of our local governments.[42]

But if he protested against the centripetal forces of government and capitalism, he was still no less critical of socialist propaganda for undermining the popular belief in the regulative powers of competition, instilling the idea that centralized control of industry was natural and inevitable.[43]

Smith's new view of the meaning of the early state constitutions reflected a significant change of attitude. Earlier, he had hailed them as steps on the road to unlimited popular rule. Now he asserted that they had been based on the theory that "power, even though supposed to rest wholly on a popular basis, was, nevertheless, thought of as limited."[44] Ruefully he observed that the growth of the idea of unlimited popular power had led to the decline of belief in natural rights and natural law. The older notion of limited government had given way to a doctrine of "governmental absolutism":[45] "Political majorities, no less than public officials, are prone to take into their own hands as much power as circumstances permit."[46]

---

[38] Published posthumously (New York, 1930) with an introduction by V. L. Parrington. "A few minutes before his death Parrington had put his signature to a foreword for a book by his late friend and colleague, J. Allen Smith." Joseph B. Harrison, *Vernon Louis Parrington*, University of Washington Chapbooks, No. 31 (Seattle, 1929), p. 29.

[39] Parrington, *Main Currents*, Vol. 3, p. 412.

[40] In a letter to John A. Kingsbury, quoted in Goldman, *op. cit. supra* n. 9, at p. 210.

[41] *Growth*, pp. 194–95.

[42] Goldman, *ibid.*, pp. 210–11.

[43] *Growth*, pp. 226–28.

Like many who had witnessed the crusade to make the world safe for democracy, Smith voiced a growing disillusionment with public opinion. Observing that we had not yet reached the stage of development in which the people possessed the degree of civic intelligence demanded by democracy, he commented that "the great majority have little more rational foundation for their political opinions than for their religious beliefs."[47] In a mood reminiscent of Burke or William Graham Sumner,[48] he emphasized that the political situation is the outcome of innumerable complex factors, that laws and constitutions are the results of slow growth and development, and that the most radical innovations are really but slight adaptations. Few people, he concluded, had the political intelligence or the ability to cooperate long enough to alter greatly the course of public affairs: "commonly accepted opinion, even under a purely democratic form of government, can hardly be regarded as a determining political force."[49]

III

In spite of his reputation as a hard-headed analyst of political realities, J. Allen Smith seriously misjudged some of the strongest and deepest currents in the American political tradition. Too often he found conflict where there was consensus, and unity where there was diversity. His preoccupation with the Constitution as the product of social conflict and conservative reaction led him into that genetic fallacy which judges institutions more by their origins than by their later growth, and so the smoke of Shay's rebellion and the din of the ratification struggle continually intruded themselves into his pages. His division of society into the few and the many came close to being a morality play division of the world into the elect and the damned, and, with his conspiracy theory of the American constitutional system, blinded him to the deep popular consensus on which that system rests.

As it has been suggested that aristocratic conservatives like Hamilton and Fisher Ames projected an unreal demonology of "the howling mob" because they ignored the deep attachment of that "mob" to property rights and constitutional government,[50] so might it be said of J. Allen Smith that, by ignoring that same deep attachment, he had fallen into a radical version of the same error. He projected an unreal picture of the classes versus the masses, and belabored an unconvincing conspiracy theory. He was never able to appreciate the point of such wise exaggeration as Jefferson's famous insistence that "every difference of opinion is not a difference of principle. We have called by different names brethren of the same principle. We are all Republicans—we are all Federalists";[51] nor could he have found much comfort in the quip that the difference between the two great American political parties is the difference between Tweedledee and Tweedledum. Unlike later writers who have been heartened by this diagnosis, he would not have agreed that the "disease" is better than its cure. But if discord loomed so large for Smith that he underestimated agreement, he was also not beyond falling into a contrary error, for his conception of "the people" as homogeneous and monolithic squared poorly with the realities of an endlessly diverse and pluralistic continental federalism. His conception of direct democracy could have led only to disillusionment.

---

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 185.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 163.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 114.

[48] Sumner, *The Challenge of Facts and Other Essays*, ed. A. G. Keller (New Haven, 1914).

[49] *Growth*, pp. 82–83.

One of the most intriguing turns of thought revealed in Smith's later work has never adequately been discussed either by his admirers or his critics. This was his surprising shift from a Rousseauan rejection of checks and balances and the group basis of politics, to an adulation of that prophet of nullification and concurrent majority, high priest of checks and balances, the South Carolina Aristotle, John C. Calhoun. Referring to Calhoun's views on the nature of the union, Smith declared that he had written with "unanswerable logic"[52] in treatises which for "convincing agrument have never been equalled in all the literature dealing with constitutional interpretation."[53] In this vein Smith wrote sympathetically of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of 1798, argued that the Framers had not intended to establish national supremacy, and approved Calhoun's doctrine that the Constitution can only be finally interpreted and changed by the concurrent action of the federal and state governments. Voicing his regret that the Framers had omitted the word "expressly" from their grant of powers to Congress, he even went so far as to disapprove the doctrine of implied powers.[54]

Smith's new found acceptance of Calhoun's views on the federal system hinged chiefly on his own attachment to the decentralization and local autonomy which Calhoun had glorified for quite another purpose. This, the weakest element in Calhoun, he applauded openly. But he never avowed the strongest aspect of Calhoun's thought, its pluralism. Yet there was implicit in his later thinking a deep sense of the organic nature of group and sectional interests and an emphasis upon the multi-group society which was hardly compatible with the monolithic conception of the popular will which dominated his earlier thought. In protesting state encroachment on local government, he asserted that a state is a purely arbitrary division, while a city is a "natural and organic unit with interests peculiarly its own."[55] Even properly apportioned state legislatures, he affirmed, cannot be representative of the various local interests of the state: the people of an agricultural community, for example, have no interest in or concern with legislation relating to municipal utilities.[56] Here, surely, was the seed of a theory of functional representation whose implications Smith never squared with his earlier views.

---

[50] Louis Hartz, "The Whig Tradition in America and Europe," this REVIEW, Vol. 46, pp. 989–1002 (December, 1952).

[51] First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1801. Quoted in *Jefferson Himself*, ed. Bernard Mayo (Boston, 1942), p. 221.

[52] *Growth*, p. 159.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

Perhaps the gravest weakness of J. Allen Smith's political thought was his failure ever to have reconciled the two conflicting images of the political process which are implicit in his work. The significance of this issue far exceeds the mere question of a crucial irresolution in his own thought, for it goes to the very heart of the problem of government. On the one hand was the Rousseauan image with its emphasis upon unleashing the monolithic will of the people, seeking unanimity as its ideal, but settling for majority rule in practice; fearful of centralization and a policy-making bureaucracy, a "state governed by clerks";[57] fearful of representative government with its remoteness from the popular will, and rejecting the whole fantastic notion of the balance of powers; ever suspicious of sinister interest groups and parties—worms within the entrails of the body politic, as Hobbes thought them;[58] Platonic in its emphasis on man fulfilling himself as Citizen; and hopefully envisioning man and the world remade. On the other hand was the image suggested by Madison in *The Federalist*,[59] with its Calvinist view of man as considerably lower than the angels; its rugged insistence on the ineluctable group basis of politics, its sense of the irreducible conflicts of class, section, and creed; its view of politics as the realm of compromise and the imperfect: the art, not of the best, but of the possible and the second best; its deep rejection of Utopianism; its skepticism of the primacy of politics; its conviction that the problem of power does not disappear when the voice of the people plays at being the voice of God; its insistence that the source of law is not full guarantee of its rightness; and its abiding attachment to the need, above and beyond the suffrage, for those constitutional "auxiliary precautions,"[60] with their counterpoise and plurality of powers, which so complement the multi-group "diversity of the community that its own pluralism is reflected in a pluralism within the government."[61] These were the polar opposites between which Parrington believed the main currents of American political thought have moved.[62] It is curious indeed that Smith uneasily embraced both of them.

---

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 193.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 194.

[57] Jean Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, Bk. II, ch. 9, Everyman's Library edition (London, 1946), p. 38.

[58] Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan*, ch. 29, Everyman's Library edition (London, 1947), p. 177.

[59] *The Federalist*, Nos. 10, 51, Modern Library edition (New York, n.d.).

[60] *Ibid.*, No. 51.

[61] Norton E. Long, "Bureaucracy and Constitutionalism," this REVIEW, Vol. 46, pp. 808–818 (September, 1952), at p. 811.

"Militant Jeffersonian Populist"[63] that he was, J. Allen Smith never made his peace with political or industrial Leviathans. There was in him a nostalgic tendency to look longingly after statecraft on a scale suited to "a nation of villagers."[64] Parrington was just as fearful of the future as Smith had ever been:[65]

> An industrialized society is reshaping the psychology fashioned by an agrarian world; the passion for liberty is lessening and the individual . . . is being dwarfed; the drift of centralization is shaping its inevitable tyrannies to bind us with.

But Parrington admitted what Smith had never really faced, "the final defeat of the traditional agrarianism":[66]

> The disintegration of the earlier romanticisms . . . has run its course. The philosophy of Jefferson and John Taylor, with its physiocratic bias, its antipathy to a money economy, its love of local autonomy, has been buried in the potter's field.

And so, unlike Smith, Parrington had begun to wonder whether it might not be necessary to "take our bearings afresh and set forth on a different path to the goal."[67] Smith's failure to come to grips convincingly with the adjustment of means and ends led him into what Lord Bacon called "the solecism of power, to think to command the end and yet not to endure the means."[68] Even his admirers came to admit that his Jeffersonian views were irrelevant to the problems of an industrial society, that time had left him behind.[69] But we cannot afford to smile condescendingly at Smith's plight, for the dilemma he faced is as crucial today for new conservatives as for new Fabians: many an American liberal "has begun to wonder, with J. Allen Smith, whether incessant centralization is liberalism's best hope."[70]

The greatest limitations of J. Allen Smith's thought for the present obviously stem from the inherent weakness of his oversimplified analyses of American society and of democracy, and from the difficulty of fitting into the contours of his teaching those developments which, burgeoning in his day, have become the very matrix of present day political thought: the growth of the administrative state and the rise of the United States as a world power. His significance lies less in the dogmas he proclaimed than in the predicaments he revealed, and in the questions he often failed to answer and sometimes never asked; in some ways "he was like one of those revolving lighthouses which radiate momentary gleams of revealing light far out into the surrounding gloom and then suddenly relapse into complete darkness."[71] But perhaps it is true that a man ought to be known by the dilemmas he keeps. We should reckon J. Allen Smith's worth less by the battles he won than by the Goliaths he was bold enough to seek to slay. To him we may apply Parrington's words: "Communing with ghosts is not unprofitable to one who listens to their tales,"[72] nor without meaning to those who "like Merlin pursue the light of their hopes where it flickers above the treacherous marshlands."[73] Scholar, teacher, democrat, gentleman, he was a useful reminder that truth is as often compounded of wormwood as of treacle, and a fitting exemplar of the dictum that a professor is a man who thinks otherwise.

---

[62] *Main Currents*, Vol. 1, pp. 267–273.

[63] Alfred Kazin, *On Native Grounds* (New York, 1942), p. 149.

[64] Walter Lippmann used this phrase of G. B. Shaw's to characterize the longings of Bryan and Wilson. *Drift and Mastery* (New York, 1914), pp. 128–48.

[65] Parrington, *ibid.*, Vol. 3, p. xx.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. xxvii.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. xxviii.

[68] Francis Bacon, "Of Empire," *Essays*, No. 19, World's Classics edition (Oxford 1930), p. 52.

[69] Seagle, *loc. cit. supra* n. 27.

[70] Goldman, *op. cit. supra* n. 9, at p. 212.

---

[71] David Lloyd George, characterizing Lord Kitchener. *War Memoirs* (Boston, 1933), Vol. 2, p. 194, quoted by Lindsay Rogers, Foreword to Robert H. Connery, *The Administration of an N. R. A. Code* (Chicago, 1938), p. xviii.

[72] Parrington, *ibid.*, Vol. 2, p. i.

[73] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. vii.

BOOK REVIEWS, NOTES, AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ARTICLE ... 1107

Selected Material for a Comparative Study of Local Government. HAROLD ZINK ... 1107

REVIEWS OF BOOKS ... 1134

Dahl, A Preface to Democratic Theory. HERBERT McCLOSKY ... 1134
Coulborn (ed.), Feudalism in History. CARL J. FRIEDRICH ... 1136
Apter, The Gold Coast in Transition. JAMES S. COLEMAN ... 1138
Scammon (ed.), America Votes—A Handbook of Contemporary American Election Statistics. ALEXANDER HEARD ... 1141
Key, American State Politics: An Introduction. CHARLES M. HARDIN. 1143
Lubell, Revolt of the Moderates. JAMES C. DAVIES ... 1144
Williams, The Conservative Party of Canada, 1920–1949. WALTER O. FILLEY ... 1146
Dallin, The Changing World of Soviet Russia: An Analysis of Soviet Internal and External Policies; *Dewar*, Labour Policy in the USSR, 1917–1928. ALFRED G. MEYER ... 1147
Rustow, The Politics of Compromise: A Study of Parties and Cabinet Government in Sweden. ROY V. PEEL ... 1149
Spero, Labor Relations in British Nationalized Industry; *Baldwin*, Beyond Nationalization: The Labor Problems of British Coal. BEN W. LEWIS ... 1150
Akzin, New States and International Organizations. CHARLES S. ASCHER ... 1152
Brown, Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691–1780. CECELIA M. KENYON ... 1153
Brown, Charles Beard and the Constitution: A Critical Analysis of "An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution." MAURICE KLAIN ... 1154
Ekirch, The Civilian and the Military. PAUL Y. HAMMOND ... 1156
Manuel, The New World of Henri Saint-Simon. JAMES H. MEISEL ... 1158
Vinacke, Far Eastern Politics in the Postwar Period. HAROLD S. QUIGLEY ... 1159
Li, The Historical Status of Tibet. WILLIAM M. McGOVERN ... 1161
Vanderbilt, Judges and Jurors: Their Functions, Qualifications and Selection; *Aumann*, The Instrumentalities of Justice: Their Forms, Functions and Limitations. DAVID FELLMAN ... 1162
Trachsel and *Wade*, The Government and Administration of Wyoming; *Caldwell*, The Government and Administration of New York; *Highsaw* and *Fortenberry*, The Government and Administration of Mississippi; *Doyle*, *Laird* and *Weiss*, The Government and Administration of Florida; *Rankin*, The Government and Administration of

North Carolina; *Gosnell* and *Anderson,* The Government and Administration of Georgia. W. Duane Lockard 1164
Ross, Elections and Electors: Studies in Democratic Representation. William S. Livingston 1166

BOOK NOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY 1168

American Government and Politics 1168
Foreign and Comparative Government 1180
International Law and Relations 1190
Political Theory, Research, and Methodology 1203
Other Books Received 1217

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ARTICLE

Selected Materials for a Comparative Study of Local Government

HAROLD ZINK
Ohio State University

Literature on local government is extensive in such countries as the United States, United Kingdom, and Sweden, fairly comprehensive in such countries as France and Germany, and almost if not quite non-existent in certain of the under-developed countries. With the limited space available, it has seemed desirable not to include any materials relating to the English-speaking countries, since these are generally well known to scholars. An attempt has been made to bring in representative local government systems from the major areas of the world, but neither the Soviet Union, the Peoples' Republic of China, nor any satellite country is included, mainly because of failure to find specialists who would undertake the task. Since this article is likely to be used primarily by those whose linguistic competence is limited to English or a European language, emphasis has been placed on materials in these languages, but as much attention as has seemed feasible has been given to sources in other languages.[1]

It is not surprising that the great preponderance of research in local government has thus far related to specific countries. Nevertheless, there has been some recognition of the importance of comparative studies in local government, and interest in such projects seems to be growing slowly at present.

The earlier studies of William B. Munro, *The Government of European Cities* (New York, Macmillan, 1909) and William Anderson, ed., *Local Government in Europe* (New York, Appleton-Century, 1939) may be cited as somewhat isolated examples of earlier comparative works in the local government field. The quite recent studies of William A. Robson, ed., *Great Cities of the World* (London, Allen and Unwin, 1955), International Union of Local Authorities, *Local Government Finance and Its Importance for Local Autonomy* (The Hague, 1955), and "Village Government in Eastern and Southern Asia: A Symposium," *Far Eastern Quarterly*, February, 1956, represent significant projects in the present-day comparison of local government institutions and problems. A pilot study undertaken by the International Political Science Association, under the sponsorship of UNESCO, of rural local government in India, Italy, and Sweden,[2] and a more comprehensive survey, now in progress, by the International Union of Local Authorities, also sponsored by UNESCO, of local government throughout the world may indicate something of the current recognition of the need for local government studies which cross national boundaries.

---

[1] In addition to those who have contributed the various sections of this bibliographical article, thanks are due to Charles S. Ascher, Fred W. Riggs, and the International Union of Local Authorities for assistance in its preparation.

[2] In this research study, Harold Zink of Ohio State University served as general reporter, and Professors R. Bhaskaran of Madras University, F. Benvenuti of Padua University, and A. Wåhlstrand of the School of Social Work and Municipal Administration of Gothenberg, as national reporters.

FRENCH LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BRIAN CHAPMAN
University of Manchester

Local government institutions before the Revolution are dealt with best in either Fr. Olivier-Martin, *Précis d'histoire du droit français* (Paris, Dalloz, 1945) or E. Perrot, *Les institutions publiques et privées de l'ancienne France jusqu'en 1789* (Paris, Sirey, 1935). The history of local government during the revolutionary period and the institutions which then emerged to form the basis of modern local government are dealt with most comprehensively in J. Godechot, *Les institutions de la France sous la Révolution et l'Empire* (Paris, 1951). The pattern of local government created by Napoleon has remained in many respects formally the same to the present day. The development in the nineteenth century can be traced through C. A. Vuillefroy and L. Monnier, *Principes d'administration: extraits des avis du Conseil d'Etat et du Comité de l'Intérieur* . . . (Paris, Joubert, 1837); L. M. de Cormenin, *Droit administratif* (2 vols., Paris, Paguernel, 5th ed., 1840), particularly Vol. 1; M. Macarel, *Cours d'administration et de droit administratif* (Paris, Plon, 1852); A. F. A. Vivien, *Etudes administratives* (2 vols., Paris, de Guillaumin, 1859); and A. Batbie, *Traité théorique et pratique de droit public et administratif* (9 vols. and 2 supplements, Paris, Larose et Forcel, 2nd ed., 1885), especially Vols. 3, 4, and 7.

Since then all the major jurists have devoted much space in their treatises on *droit administratif* to the structure and place of local government: e.g., Duguit, Hauriou, Jèze. At present L. Rolland, *Précis de droit administratif* (Paris, Dalloz, 1947) and M. Waline, *Traité élémentaire de droit administratif* (Paris, Sirey, 6th ed., 1951) are outstandingly helpful.

The basic laws on local government, the organization and powers of municipal authorities, of departmental authorities, of budgetary control, of personnel, of elections, are in the *Code Dalloz*, which is frequently brought up-to-date. For special points and for the jurisprudence concerning local authorities, one must consult the *Recueil des Arrêts du Conseil d'Etat statuant au contentieux* . . . (Paris, Sirey, Collection Lebon et Panhard). The general theory of centralization and decentralization in France is discussed in C. Eisenmann, *Centralisation et décentralisation* (Paris, LGDJ, 1948). A simple statement of the relations between types of local authorities is in R. Jannin, "Les collectivités locales" in *L'Organisation gouvernementale de la France* (Paris, Documentation Française, 1952), which also contains a section by R. Maspétiol, "Les rapports entre le pouvoir central et les collectivités locales." R. Maspétiol et P. Laroque, *La tutelle administrative* (Paris, 1931) and R. Nestor, *Le contrôle du préfet sur l'ad-*

ministration communale (thesis, Paris University, 1931) deal more specifically with central control, the former being the standard work.

An excellent general survey and history of local government during and after the war is P. Doueil, *L'Administration locale à l'épreuve de la guerre, 1939–1949* (Paris, Sirey, 1950). J. Gandouin, *La constitution et la réforme de l'organisation départementale et communale* (thesis, Paris University, 1950) is a good description of the postwar efforts at reforming local government and the constitutional basis of present local government. B. Chapman, *Introduction to French Local Government* (London, Allen and Unwin, 1953) is an account of the present status and functioning of local government in terms of political science.

The organization of communal government is dealt with in R. Maspétiol, *L'Organisation municipale* (Paris, Sirey, 1934). The problem of the very small commune is discussed in P. Roy, *L'Administration intercommunale: le problème des petites communes* (thesis, Bordeaux University, 1944). Of the various recommendations for reform, R. Lainville, *Vers la réforme municipale* (Paris, Sirey, 1946) and J. Boulonnois, *La réforme municipale* (Pontoise, Lachevre, 1946) are particularly to be noted.

Communal personnel and their status and rights are discussed for the prewar period by M. Aragon, *Les administrateurs communaux et intercommunaux* (Paris, Sirey, 1935); for the post-war period by P. Bertrand, *Le statut du personnel communal* (Paris, Sirey, 1946). The text of the present law is in "Statut général du personnel des communes et des établissements publics communaux," *Journal officiel*, Paris, 1952. The organization and powers of municipal and general police are treated by P.-H. Teitgen, *La police municipale générale* (thesis, Nancy University, 1934); H. Roth, *L'Organisation de la police d'état en France* (thesis, Lyons University, 1943); and P. Chemineau, *Etude de l'organisation administrative de la police en France* (thesis, Toulouse University, 1944). Local government finance is precisely and clearly described in R. Lainville, *Le budget communal* (Paris, Sirey, 7th ed., 1951); there is some useful material in the general survey of the Ministry of Finance, *Inventaire de la situation financière 1913–1949* (Paris, 1949); and an authoritative account of its shortcomings has been published by the Ministry of the Interior, *Rapport présenté par l'Inspection Générale, Tome I: Sur la réforme des finances locales* (Paris, 1951). The most recent and fully comprehensive study is Jean Singer, *Traité général des finances communales et départementales* (Paris, 1956).

A commented text of the law on departmental organization and administration is ed. R. Bonnaud-Delamare, *Loi du 10 août 1871 relative aux conseils généraux mise à jour et complétée par différents textes législatifs* (Niort, 1950). The same author has compiled a list of the powers exercised by members of the prefectoral corps in *Attributions juridiques des préfets et sous-préfets* (Monte Carlo, Editions du Livre, 1951). A general study of provincial life and administration is B. Chapman, *The Prefects and Provincial France* (London, Allen and Unwin, 1955). The powers and position of secretaries-general of the prefectures are to be found in P. Guerrini, *Origines et pouvoirs du secrétaire général* *de préfecture* (thesis, Lyons University, 1938) and P. Rix, *Le secrétaire général de préfecture* (thesis, Toulouse University, 1938). The recruitment and regulations governing the prefectoral corps are gathered together in two publications of the Ministry of the Interior, *Statut particulier du corps préfectoral* (Paris, 1951) and *Recrutement des chefs de cabinet de préfet* (Boulogne-sur-Seine, 1952). These officials are, however, in some respects still covered by the "Statut général des fonctionnaires," *Recueil des documents et textes relatifs à l'application de la loi* (Documentation française, 1950). For the status of the ordinary personnel of the prefectures, two reports of the Inspection Générale de l'Administration are important: *Rapport présenté par l'Inspection Générale pour l'organisation et le personnel des préfectures départementales* (Melun, 1942) and Tome II, *Sur l'organisation et les effectifs des préfectures* (1950–51) of the report cited above.

Regionalism has been a controversial issue in France during most of the century. The best pre-war book on the subject is probably M. Brun, *Départements et régions* (Paris, Presses Modernes, 1939). Under Vichy, regional administration came to be widely used; P. Gay, *Le préfet régional* (Paris, Sirey, 1942) gives some idea of the changes then made. J. B. Bancal, *Les circonscriptions administratives de la France* (Paris, Sirey, 1945) picks up the pre-war thread after the war and is an able exposition of the problem in geographic and administrative terms. The existence of regional services and the appointment of a type of regional prefect in 1948 have led to several important practical changes in French local government, ably dealt with in J. Legrand, *Les essais d'administration régionale* (thesis, Paris University, 1950).

The special position of Paris is illustrated in Raymond-Laurent, *Paris, sa vie municipale* (Paris, Godde, 1938); M. Félix, *Le régime administratif et financier du département de la Seine et de la Ville de Paris* (2 vols., Paris, Rousseau, 1945); and B. Chapman, "The Government of Paris," in W. A. Robson, ed., *Great Cities of the World* (London, Allen and Unwin, 1954). Chapman has dealt with "The Prefecture of Police in Paris" in the *Journal of Criminal Law* (Northwestern University, 1953). The powers and organization of the two prefectures in Paris are set forth in *Organisation et attributions des services du Département de la Seine et de la Ville de Paris* and *Organisation et attributions des services de la Préfecture de Police,* both published by the Imprimerie Municipale, Paris.

An excellent study on the problems of town planning and housing as they affect all local authorities is A. Bordessoule et P. Guillemain, *Les collectivités locales et les problèmes de l'urbanisme et du logement* (Paris, Sirey, 1956).

There are many specialized articles on French local government in the *Revue administrative, Revue du droit public, Revue des collectivités locales,* and *Bulletin d'information de l'Association du Corps Préfectoral,* all published in Paris.

ITALIAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

BRIAN CHAPMAN
University of Manchester

Most works on Italian local government are formalistic and legalistic. In the course of the unification, 1859–61, the institutions of local government then existing in Piedmont were extended to the rest of the country; these institutions had been borrowed from the French; consequently the formal structure of Italian local government is very similar to the French. The original law on local government was the law of October 23, 1859, *sull' amministrazione communale e provinciale.* Various relations and modifications to this law proposed by the Chamber of Deputies in the period 1862–64 are to be found in *Camera dei Deputati, Sessione 1863–64, Documenti,* Vol. I.

The extension of this system of local government to all Italy provoked considerable opposition, particularly from the northern states. In Milan a school of federalist thought, led by Carlo Cattaneo and G. Ferrari, had a strong following for some time. Cattaneo's works are scattered but show a mind of exceptional quality. The best collection is ed. A. Bertani, *Opere edite ed inedite di Carlo Cattaneo* (3 vols., Florence, 1890). There is apparently no complete collection of Ferrari's works, but G. Schinetti has edited a small volume of *Le più belle pagine di G. Ferrari* (Milan, 1927). The most notable supporter in political life of a different form of regional government was M. Minghetti, Minister of the Interior after the unification. He wrote a book on the subject, *Le regioni* (Florence, 1867), and his proposed law, with speeches, is to be found in his *Discorsi parlamentari* (Rome, 1888). In *I partiti politici e la ingerenza loro nella giustizia e nell' amministrazione* (Bologna, 1881), he developed a theme common to many writers of the period: that much of the *malaise* of political life was due to the occult influence of territorial groups, forced by the nature of the centralized state to maneuver in Parliament. Three important jurists of the late nineteenth century made similar criticisms in their writings on local government: G. F. Ferraris, *Teoria del decentramento amministrativo* (Palermo, 1898); G. Saredo, *La nuova legge sulla amministrazione communale e provinciale* (2 vols., Turin, 1889); and Riccomanni, *Lo Stato ed i poteri locali* (Rome, 1873). A penetrating exposure of the situation which still existed after the Great War is in the *Relazione della Commissione Parlamentare d'Inchiesta sull' ordinamento delle amministrazioni di Stato e sulla condizione del personale* (2 vols., Rome, 1921).

A coordinated and consolidated text of local government laws was issued by the Regio Decreto of March 3, 1934: *Testo unico della legge communale e provinciale*; an up-to-date version of this was edited by C. Martino and published in 1953 by Ilte in Turin. This text covers the administration, personnel, finance, tutelage, and recruitment of provinces, communes, and the government of Rome. A commentary on the text was made by A. Lentini, *Commento al T.U. della legge communale e provinciale* (Milan, 1950); the same author discussed the position of local government personnel in his *Lo stato giuridico dei dipendenti* *degli enti autarchici* (Catania, 1951?). He also published a systematic work of some quality entitled *L'amministrazione locale* (2nd. ed., Como, 1953).

Probably the best contemporary work for obtaining information on the legal conditions and status of local authorities in terms of national law and jurisprudence is A. M. Sandulli, *Manuale di diritto amministrativo* (Jovene, Naples, 2nd ed., 1954). Also to be noted is G. Zanobini, *L'amministrazione locale* (Milan, n.d.).

In 1945 there was considerable discussion of the future form of local government in Italy; it now has a constitutional status. The Ministero per la Costituente issued the *Relazioni all'Assemblea Costituente*: Vol. II is on *Autonomie locali*. The work of the commissions concerned with drafting the new constitution, two of which were concerned with local government, are published as *Atti della Commissione per la Costituzione* (Rome, 1946).

The new constitution not only contained a special section on local government but created a new form of local authority, the region. Indeed, Italy is, for constitutional lawyers, now "a State characterized by regional autonomy," somewhere between the unitary and the federal state. Its theoretical foundations are to be found in G. Ambrosini, *Autonomia regionale e federalismo* (Rome, 1946). The legal status of different kinds of local autonomy have a respectable history and Santi Romano, "Decentramento amministrativo" in *Enciclopedia giuridica italiana* (Milan, 1897) and P. Bodda, "Autarchia amministrativa" in *Dizionario di politica*, Vol. I (Rome, 1936), should be noted. For the present constitutional position of local authorities, including the regions, perhaps the best work is still V. Falzone, F. Palermo, and F. Cosentino, *La Costituzione della repubblica italiana* (Rome, 1948); it is also discussed in all text-books on constitutional law: e.g., G. Balladore Pallieri, *Diritto costituzionale* (Milan, 1949). Two works on regional government are G. Miele, *Le regioni* (Florence, 1951) and B. Chapman, *Italian Regional Government* (thesis, Oxford University, 1951). The statutes of the special self-governing regions are most easily obtainable in the official *Documenti di vita italiana* (Sicily, no. 13; Sardinia, no. 17; Val d'Aosta, no. 19; Trentino-Alto-Adige, no. 21). The regional governments have produced their own *Codice regionale* and a considerable amount of other material.

There is a considerable bibliography on particular aspects of local government in several reviews. Perhaps those to be most closely studied are the *Nuova rassegna*, *Rivista trimestrale di diritto pubblico*, *Corriere amministrativa*, *Amministrazione italiana*, *Rivista amministrativa*, and *Rivista della corte dei conti*.

GERMAN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

ROGER H. WELLS
Bryn Mawr College

On German state and local government before 1945, James K. Pollock and Homer Thomas, *Germany in Power and in Eclipse* (New York, Van Nostrand, 1952) is a mine of information; it deals with the pre-Weimar, Weimar, and Nazi periods and has numerous maps and bibliographies. Books published before World War I include William B. Munro, *The Government of European Cities* (New York, Macmillan, 1909), with a long chapter on Prussian cities, and William H. Dawson, *Municipal Life and Government in Germany* (London, Longman's, 1914). A recent outstanding work is Heinrich Heffter, *Die deutsche Selbstverwaltung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, Koehler, 1950), dealing mainly with the nineteenth century, but reaching back into the eighteenth and forward into the twentieth. It is a history of German ideas about self-government, particularly at state and local levels, and what was done or attempted to implement them.

For the Weimar Republic, Frederic F. Blachly and Miriam E. Oatman, *The Government and Administration of Germany* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1928) has two chapters and a bibliography on state and local government. The texts of all the state constitutions are given in Otto Ruthenberg, ed., *Verfassungsgesetze des deutschen Reichs und der deutschen Länder* (Berlin, Vahlen, 1926). A more detailed analysis, stressing cities but with some attention to states and other local units, is Roger H. Wells, *German Cities* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1932), with ten pages of bibliography on German sources.

For Nazi Germany, besides the material in Pollock and Thomas, *op. cit.*, reference is made to Fritz Morstein Marx's valuable chapter in William Anderson, ed., *Local Government in Europe* (New York, Appleton-Century, 1939), to which is appended a translation of the Deutsche Gemeindeordnung (German Municipal Government Code) of 1935. This law, stripped of its Nazi features, was widely copied in the Gemeindeordnungen adopted in the decade 1945–1955.

On West Germany (since 1949, the Federal Republic of Germany), there is considerable information in print.[1] The official publications of state and local units have largely been restored after the lapses of the war and early postwar years.[2] They include state law gazettes (*Gesetz- und Verordnungsblätter*), proceedings of state legislatures, statistical yearbooks, handbooks and administrative reports, decisions of higher state administrative courts, and a vast quantity of local government documents.[3]

---

[1] Federal-state relations, Polish administration of the territory east of the Oder-Neisse Line, and the Saar are not covered in this bibliography. Moreover, space does not permit much discussion of Berlin, East Germany, and Allied military government (1944–1949). A standard work on postwar Berlin is Elmer Plischke, *Berlin: Development of Its Government and Administration* (Bad Godesberg, Office of the U. S. High Commissioner for Germany, 1952) which includes an English translation of the West Berlin constitution of 1950. In the German Democratic Republic, state and local governments have fared as badly as they did under the Nazi regime, the states being abolished in 1952. Some comment on the subject is found in Kurt Glaser's chapter in Litchfield's volume (cited above in the text), and in a chapter in J. P. Nettl, *The Eastern Zone and Soviet Policy in Germany, 1945–1950* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1951). On allied military government, see Lucius D. Clay, *Decision in Germany* (Garden City, Doubleday, 1950; Harold Zink, *American Military Government in Germany* (New York, Macmillan, 1947); Wolfgang G. Friedmann, *The Allied Military Government of Germany* (London, Stevens, 1947).

[2] On the earlier documentation, see Everett S. Brown, *Manual of Government Publications: United States and Foreign* (New York, Appleton-Century, 1950), pp. 85–87.

The state constitutions and laws on state and local government are available, not only in official gazettes of the Länder, but also in convenient collections which often have introductions and commentaries. Texts and English translations of the state constitutions of the U. S., French, and Soviet Zones are provided in *Constitutions of the German Länder* (Berlin, Office of Military Government for Germany (US), 1947). The constitutions adopted after 1947 are those of Hamburg, Lower Saxony, North Rhine-Westphalia, Schleswig-Holstein, and Baden-Württemberg. For the Hamburg constitution, see Wilhelm Loeschelder, ed., *Die Gemeindeordnungen in den westdeutschen Ländern und die Verfassungen von Berlin, Hamburg und Bremen* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1953), which also contains the text of all the Gemeindeordnungen except those enacted by Lower Saxony and Baden-Württemberg in 1955.[4] Johannes Hohlfeld, ed., *Dokumente der deutschen Politik und Geschichte von 1848 bis zur Gegenwart* (Berlin, Wendler, 8 vols., 1951–1955) reprints the Schleswig-Holstein constitution (Landessatzung) of 1949 (Vol. 6, pp. 456 ff), the Lower Saxony constitution of 1951 (Vol. 7, pp. 23 ff), and the Baden-Württemberg constitution of 1953 (Vol. 8, pp. 285 ff). For each state, scholars or officials have edited collections of laws on state and local government. See e.g., Günter Dürig, ed., *Gesetze des Landes Baden-Württemberg* (Munich, Beck, 1956).

Under general works, a comprehensive analysis is Edward H. Litchfield *et al.*, *Governing Postwar Germany* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1953). Besides two chapters on state and local government by Roger H. Wells, other topical chapters include state and local material. J. F. J. Gillen, *State and Local Government in West Germany, 1945–1953* (Bad Godesberg, Office of the U. S. High Commissioner for Germany, 1953) deals mainly with the U. S. Zone and Bremen and briefly with the British and French Zones. An earlier study is Comstock Glaser, *Land and Local Government in the U. S. Zone of Germany* (Berlin, Office of Military Government for Germany (US), 1947). Alfred Grosser, ed., *Administration et politique en Allemagne occidentale* (Paris, Colin, 1954) includes "case studies" of four states (Lower Saxony, Hesse, North Rhine-Westphalia, Baden-Württemberg) and four cities (Düsseldorf, Trier, Göttingen, and Heiligenhafen).[5]

More specialized publications include Joseph H. Kaiser, *Der Landtag* (pamphlet, Munich, Hochschule für politische Wissenschaften, 1951); Götz

---

[3] For further details about the Gemeindeordnungen, see Roger H. Wells' article in the *National Municipal Review*, Vol. 45, pp. 66–71 (February 1956).

[4] A. Koehler and K. Jansen, eds., *Die Bundesrepublik, 1954/55* (Berlin, Heymann, 1956) is a directory of the governmental organs of the Federal Republic, the states, and the principal local units. An important source of current municipal data is the *Statistisches Jahrbuch deutscher Gemeinden* (Brunswick, Waisenhaus), published annually by the Deutscher Städtetag, the association of the larger German cities.

[5] Among reference works on Germany, one of the most useful on state and local matters is Klaus Mehnert and Heinrich Schulte, *Deutschland Jahrbuch* (Essen, Rheinisches-Westfälisches Verlagskontor, 1st ed., 1949; 2nd ed., 1953).

Roth, *Fraktion und Regierungsbildung* (Meisenheim, Hain, 1954), a study of the formation of the cabinet of Lower Saxony in 1951, a monograph of a series edited by Dolf Sternberger, *Parteien-Fraktionen-Regierungen;* Ernst Walz *et al.*, *Die Mittelstufe der Verwaltung* (Frankfurt, Institut zur Förderung öffentlicher Angelegenheiten, 1950); Hans Peters, ed., *Handbuch der kommunalen Wissenschaften und Praxis* (Berlin, Springer), of which the first of three volumes, *Kommunalverfassung*, appeared in 1956; Otto Ziebill, *Geschichte des deutschen Städtetages* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 2nd ed., 1956), a fifty years' history of the most powerful of the associations of local governments; Verein für Geschichte der deutschen Landkreise, *Die Landkreise in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1955), a ten years' history of the county government association; Fredo Wagener, *Die Städte im Landkreis* (Göttingen, Schwartz, 1955), on city-county relations; Karl Hahn, *Praktische Kommunalverwaltung* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1954), on municipal administration; Seydel, *Die kommunalen Zweckverbände* (Göttingen, Schwartz, 1955) on the more than 5,000 local *ad hoc* authorities; Walter Bauer, *Dezentralisation der Grossstadtverwaltung* (Göttingen, Schwartz, 1955); two monographs by Henry P. Pilgert, *Community and Group Life in West Germany* and *The West German Educational System* (Bad Godesberg, Office of the U. S. High Commissioner for Germany, 1952 and 1953); Alice H. Cook, *Adult Education for Citizenship in Postwar Germany* (pamphlet, Pasadena, Fund for Adult Education, 1954); Hans Wallenberg, *Report on Democratic Institutions in West Germany* (pamphlet, New York, American Council on Germany, 1956); Theodor Steltzer and others, *Bürgerverantwortung in der Gemeinde* (Frankfurt, Institut zur Förderung öffentlicher Angelegenheiten, 1952); and Klaus A. Lindemann, *Behörde und Bürger* (Darmstadt, Roether, 1952) in the Darmstadt survey series.

The most useful periodicals on state and local government are: *Archiv des öffentlichen Rechts* (Tübingen, Mohr, quarterly); *Der Städtetag* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, monthly), the official organ of the Deutscher Städtetag; *Die Selbstverwaltung* (Heidelberg, Jedermann, monthly), the official organ of the Deutscher Landkreistag; *Politische Studien* (Munich, Isar, monthly) issued by the Munich Hochschule für politische Wissenschaften; *Zeitschrift für Politik* (Berlin, Heymann, quarterly) issued by the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik, Berlin; *Neue juristische Wochenschrift* (Munich, Beck, weekly); *Die öffentliche Verwaltung* (Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, twice monthly); and *Deutsches Verwaltungsblatt* (Berlin, Heymann, twice monthly).

SWEDISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT

ANNIKA BAUDE
Royal Library of Stockholm

Local government institutions have occupied an important place in Sweden over a long period of time and consequently it is not surprising that the literature dealing with the history of the towns and counties is extensive. Space does not permit a listing of even the more significant historical works, but the many titles will be found listed in the catalogues of the Swedish Parliamentary Library and in the Swedish historical bibliographies covering the period from 1771 to date. Note may also be made of *Katalog över stadshistoriska institutets registersamling* (Stockholm, 1937) and *Stadshistorisk revy. Register över stadshistorisk litteratur* 1920/21—, published every second year in Stockholm.

Official publications relating to local government in Sweden are numerous. Every county and most of the towns publish proceedings of their councils together with yearly collections of local acts. Some of the large cities publish local handbooks and statistical reports annually. The *Stockholms stads statistik*, published annually since 1904, is most comprehensive and contains a great deal of significant material. Much information is also included in the national statistical publications such as *Sveriges officiella statistik*, issued by the Central Statistical Bureau, which since 1913 has published special reports dealing with election returns, financial matters, and the like.

Official reports of public commissions investigating local government problems in Sweden are extensive. Some 13 reports during the period 1944–54 dealt with various aspects of local government. Examples of such reports are: Sveriges offentliga utredningar: *Betänkande med förslag till riktlinjer för en revision av rikets indelning i borgerliga primärkommuner* (1945) and *Länsstyrelsernas organisation och ställning inom länsförvaltningen* (1950).

General works dealing with Swedish local government include the following: N. Andrén, *Local Government in Sweden* (Stockholm, Swedish Institute, 1955); G. Hesslén, *Public Administration in Sweden* (Stockholm, Swedish Institute, 1952); E. Broms, *Studier rörande det svenska landstinget* (Stockholm, 1930); P. Grante, *Om den kommunala instruktions- och finansmakten* (Stockholm-Lund, 1946); T. Grünthal, *Modern kommunalförvaltning* (Stockholm, 1955); G. Heckscher, *Svensk statsförvaltning i arbete* (Stockholm, 1952); Å. Larsson, *Om kommunaltjänstemän och kommunalarbetare* (Stockholm, 1948); F. Thunborg, ed., *Den nya kommunindelningen i text, statistik och kartor* (Stockholm, 1950); P. E. Sköld and T. De la Motte, *Kommunalkunskap* (11th ed., Stockholm, 1955); and O. Sörndal, *Våra landsting och deras uppgifter* (Stockholm, 1947).

There are a number of works dealing with the legal aspects of local government in Sweden. These include: E. Fahlbeck, *Förvaltningsrättsliga studier* (2 vols., Stockholm, 1938–41); N. Herlitz, *Föreläsningar i förvaltningsrätt* (3 vols., Stockholm, 1937–42); N. Herlitz, *Förvaltningsrättsliga grunddrag* (Stockholm, 1943); H. G. F. Sundberg and H. Berglund, eds., *Kommunal författningshandbok* (3rd ed. Stockholm, 1948); R. Malmgren, *Stadsbildningen från rättslig synpunkt* (Lund, 1910); S. Sjöberg, *Det kommunala besvärsinstitutet* (Stockholm, 1948); H. G. F. Sundberg, *Kommunalrätt. Allmänna delen* (Stockholm, 3rd ed., 1949); and O. Westerberg, *Om rättskraft i förvaltningsrätten* (Stockholm, 1951).

Various periodicals are worth consulting for material relating to local government: *Kammarrättens årsbok.* (Stockholm 1927–); *Regeringsrättens årsbok* (Stockholm, 1912–); *Landskommunernas tidskrift* (Stockholm, 1920–); *Svenska stadsförbundets tidskrift* (Stockholm, 1909–); *Sveriges landstings* *tidskrift* (Stockholm, 1914–); and *Årsbok för Sveriges landsting* (Stockholm, 1936–): *Förvaltningsrättslig tidskrift* (Stockholm, 1938–) and *Nordisk administrativt tidsskrift* (København, 1920–) not only contain articles of interest but are valuable because of their bibliographies.

DANISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT

AXEL HOLM
Københavns statistiske Kontor, Copenhagen

The municipal yearbook *Kommunal Årbog*, published annually on commission by the Central trykkeriet in Copenhagen, summarizes the principal developments of local government and contains an index of books and periodicals. *Håndbog for Danske Kommuner*, edited by N. Møllmann and S. A. Hjernov (3 vols., Copenhagen, Martins Forlag, 1954–55) deals with local government in general as well as special activities on the provincial town, parish, and county levels, but it does not cover Copenhagen, Frederiksberg, and Gentofte. Ernst Andersen, *Administrativt Tilsyn med Kommunalforvaltningen.* (Copenhagen, Gads Forlag, 1940) presents a detailed discussion of the administrative control of local government. Poul Andersen, *Dansk Forvaltningsret* (Copenhagen, Nordisk Forlag, 1946) is primarily a text on administrative law but contains useful sections relating to local administration. O. Bertolt, *Kommunekundskab* (Copenhagen, Workers' Educational Federation, 1954) provides a survey of local government in Denmark for study circles. *Statistisk Årbog for Danmark*, the statistical yearbook published by the Danish Statistical Department, with index translated into English, contains various sections of interest to students of local government and lists all publications of this agency in English. Among the special reports of the Statistical Department which may be useful to local government scholars are the following: *Elections of Local Governments* (1954), *Taxes on Real Property and Persons 55/56,* 4th series, Vol. 165, no. 1 and *Accounts of Municipalities and Ports, 1946/47–1951/52,* 4th series, Vol. 161 no. 1.

For those interested in the Danish capital, the city of Copenhagen has prepared a volume in English, *Capital of a Democracy* (Copenhagen, 1955). More technical studies of the capital include: Axel Holm's *Københavns Kommunes Forfatning* (Copenhagen, pub. by the City of Copenhagen, 2nd ed., 1954), used as a textbook in the training of municipal officials, and Axel Holm and Kjeld Johansen, *København 1840–1940* (Copenhagen, Nyt Nordisk Forlag, 1941), which traces political and economic developments. *Samling af Bestemmelser vedrørende Københavns Kommune*, published annually by the city of Copenhagen and going back to 1607, contains decisions of the town council, departmental administrative decisions, and the like. An annual publication, starting in 1840, *Københavns Borgerrepraesentations Forhandlinger*, contains the proceedings of the town council of Copenhagen. *Vedtaeg for Bestyrelsen af Københavns Kommunale Anliggender* provides for the formal framework of government in Copenhagen; *Københavns Borgerrepraesentations Forretnings-*

orden lists the rules of procedure of the Copenhagen town council. The Copenhagen Statistical Office publishes an annual statistical yearbook under the title *Statistisk Årbog for København, Frederiksberg og Gentofte samt Omegnskommunerne* and a monthly statistical review, *Statistisk Månedsskrift.* The same office publishes a municipal calendar, *Københavns Kommunalkalender,* which contains an outline of the development and present organization of municipal institutions. Those interested in public finance will find *Københavns Kommunes Regnskab og Beretning om Kommunens Anliggender,* published annually by the city of Copenhagen and reporting municipal finances, and *Regnskab og Beretning fra Frederiksberg Kommune og Gentofte Kommune,* a corresponding annual report of the finances of these cities, useful.

The report of the commission appointed by the Danish Ministry of the Interior in 1939, *Betaenkning afgivet Hovedstadskommissionen* (Copenhagen, 1948) may be of interest though its recommendations relating to municipal reform have not been put into effect.

Gunnar Olsen's *De Danske Købstaeder gennem Tiderne* (Copenhagen, J. H. Schultz Forlag, 1943) presents a history of Danish provincial towns over a period of centuries. W. Oxholm's *Landkommunernes Styrelse* (Copenhagen, Nordisk Forlag, 1935) gives an account of Danish rural parish administration but is now out-of-date.

Kommunal Tidsskriftindex, published monthly by the Copenhagen town hall library, is an index of municipal periodicals and publications. *Danmarks Kommunale Efterretninger* is a municipal weekly periodical. *Købstadforeningens Tidsskrift,* published fortnightly, is the organ of the Danish Association of Provincial Towns; *Sogneràdstidende* is a weekly periodical for rural municipalities. *Nordisk Administrativt Tidsskrift,* a journal of administration, occasionally runs articles dealing with local government in the nordic countries.

LATIN AMERICAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT

LEO LOTT
Ohio State University

Publications on local government are not numerous in the Latin American countries, though materials are more adequate in Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico than elsewhere. It is to be hoped that the programs organized recently in Brazil and Costa Rica may serve to stimulate interest in this field throughout Latin America.

For useful surveys of local government in various countries of this area Austin F. MacDonald, *Latin American Government and Politics* (New York, Crowell, rev. ed., 1954) may be consulted.

The legal aspects of municipal government in Argentina are dealt with in Salvador C. Vigo, *El régimen municipal de la constitución y las leyes orgánicas municipales* (Sante Fé, Imprenta de la Universidad Nacional del Litoral, 1943). Relations of municipalities and the federal government are discussed in Luis Eduardo Molina, *El municipio argentino ante el sistema federal de gobierno* *y los preceptos de la constitución nacional* (Cordoba, Imprenta de la Universidad, 1946), and relations of provinces and the federal government in Austin F. MacDonald, *Government of the Argentine Republic* (New York, Crowell, 1942). A detailed treatise of significance is Rafael Bielsa's *Principios de régimen municipal* (Santa Fé, Imprenta de la Universidad Nacional del Litoral, 2nd ed., 1940). The important role of the city is dealt with in Horacio Julio Storni, *El municipio como institución* (Buenos Aires, Valerio Abeledo, 1949). Various aspects of Argentinian municipal administration are dealt with in Alberto G. Caldumbide, *Administración municipal* (La Plata, ed. del autor, 1942). The federal capital is discussed by Maximo I. Gomez Forgues in "El régimen municipal en la capital federal," *Revista de la facultad de derecho y ciencias sociales,* Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires, tercera época, año 4, no. 13, enero-abril, 1949, pp. 135–172. The position of provinces is discussed in Rómulo Amadeo, "Las provincias ¿ Son soberanos o autónomas?" *Boletín de la Biblioteca del Congreso Nacional,* no. 35, mayo-junio, 1940, pp. 369–375. Federal territories are treated in some detail in Juan Hilarión Lenzi, *Gobierno de territorios; conceptos básicos de la ley orgánica territorial* (Buenos Aires, Tall. gráf. de F. y M. Mercatali, 1939).

An illuminating survey of the development of municipal government in Brazil is to be found in a series of four articles by Océlio de Medeiros published in the *Revista do Servico Publico:* "A Constitucição do dereito municipal brasileiro na organização de Imperio," Ano 10, Vol. 2, nos. 3–4, julho-agôsto 1947, pp. 45ff; "O município na organização republicana até 1937," Ano. 10, Vol. 1, nos. 3–4, marco-abril 1947, pp. 50–59; "A reforma municipal na Constitucição de 1946," Ano. 10, Vol. 1, nos. 1–2, jan,-feb. 1947, pp. 49–57; and "A situação municipal na carta e no regime de 10 de novembro de 1937," Ano 10, Vol. 2, nos. 1–2, maio-junho, 1947, pp. 63–71. Two general volumes dealing with municipal government in Brazil are Orlando M. Carvalho, *Problemas fundamentales do município* (Saõ Paulo, Nacional, 1937) and Victor Nunes Leal, *Coronelismo, enxada e voto. O município e o regime representativo no Brasil* (Rio de Janeiro, 1948). Statistical material relating to the various Brazilian states is to be found in a volume issued by the Divisão Territorial do Brasil under the title *Situação administrativa vigente.* Federal territories are dealt with in Océlio de Medeiros, *Territórios federais* (Rio de Janeiro, Ed. Nacional de dereito, 1944). Local government personnel administration is discussed in J. H. Meirelles Teixeira, *O estatuto dos funcionários e a autonomia municipal* (Saõ Paulo, Prefeitura do Município de Saõ Paulo, 1947).

The development of municipal government in Latin America and especially in Chile is discussed in Manuel Ponce Jorquera, *Gobierno y autonomía municipal. Origen de los municipalidades, su establecimiento in América y el régimen actual instituído en los países americanos* (Valparaíso, Imprenta Mercantile, 1946). Treatises dealing with the legal aspects of municipal government in Chile are Jaime Guzmán Palacios, *Atribuciones, deberes y responsibilidades de los alcaldes* (Santiago, Central de publicaciones, 2nd ed., 1938) and C. Moraga Ramos, *De la responsibilidad en las municipalidades* (Valparaíso, Imprenta

Aurora de Chile, 1944). Raúl Saenz Vieyra, *Asambleas provinciales* (Valparaíso, Sociedad ed. Italiana, 1942) analyzes the functions of provincial assemblies in Chile and contains information relating to local administration.

Two general works on municipal government in Mexico are Armando Carballo, *El sistema municipal en Mexico, desde su implantación hasta la constitución de 1917 y la reforma en el D.F. de 1928 en Departamento central* (Mexico, 1936) and M. C. Rolland, *El desastre municipal en la república Mexicana* (Mexico, I. Molina M., 2nd ed., 1939). Economic aspects of municipal government are discussed in Felix Chaires González, *Estudio económico de las municipios de los Estados Unidos mexicanos* (Mexico, 1936). Three theses dealing with municipal government contain a considerable amount of significant material: Salvador González Lobo, *El municipio Mexicano* (1940), Florencio Barrera Fuentes, *Historia y destino del municipio en Mexico* (1950), and Mario Colin, *Notas sobre el municipio en Mexico* (1949): these were done at the National University of Mexico.

The remaining Latin American countries have only scattering publications in the local government field. These include: Roberto Molina, *Guía municipal de Colómbia* (Bogota, Imprenta nacional, 1936), now largely out-of-date; Ricardo Arenas Calvete, *Guía administrativo* (Bucaramanga, Colombia, Imprenta del Departmento, 1949), a more current work dealing with Colombian municipal affairs; a report of the second meeting of municipal government officials in Ecuador published under the title *Congreso de municipalidades Ecuatorianas. Segundo* (Quito, Fray Jodoco Ricke, 1951); and O. G. Ricketson, Jr., "Municipal Organization of an indian township in Guatemala," *Geographical Review*, Vol. 29, 1939, pp. 643–647.

NEAR EAST LOCAL GOVERNMENT[1]

HAROLD F. ALDERFER
Pennsylvania State University

Materials in this field are scarce, fugitive, and mostly secondary. In the states which emerged from the gradual breaking up of the Ottoman Empire, the form of local government has followed the French model. Prefects and their staffs, appointed from the national level, supervise every move of local officials, though elective local councils and chief executives give a semblance of democratic government. Thus local government has had little or no interest for the native intelligentsia or the trained civil service, and there is little indigenous literature on the subject. What exists is, for obvious linguistic reasons, not readily useful to the Western reader. Moreover, in English and French there is only too little; still less, in German, Italian, or Russian.

The legal foundations of local government are found in the constitutions of the national states. Helen Miller Davis, *Constitutions, Electoral Laws, and*

---

[1] Since the REVIEW hopes to publish in a later issue a bibliographical article on government and administration in Arab Asia, Professor Alderfer has confined his bibliography to non-Arab countries: Greece, Turkey, Egypt, the Sudan, and Iran.—[ED.]

Treaties of States in the Near and Middle East (Durham, Duke University Press, rev. ed., 1953), in which constitutions and other documents are translated into English or French, is basic. A current source of documentary materials and authoritative articles is the *Middle East Journal,* published quarterly since 1947 by the Middle East Institute, Washington, D. C. *The Royal Central Asian Journal,* published quarterly since 1914 by the Royal Central Asian Society of London, and *Middle East Affairs,* a monthly publication of the Council for Middle East Affairs, are authoritative and informative.

The Middle East Institute recently published *Current Research in the Middle East,* 1955, a definitive 175-page volume which contains 1,018 entries arranged as to topic, researcher, sponsoring organization, time of completion, and scope of work now going forward in the universities and institutes of the Middle East and Western world. Political science is one of the main subjects included. The Royal Institute of International Affairs in 1950 published *The Middle East, a Political and Economic Survey* (London and New York, 1950), which contains brief sketches of provincial and local governmental organization in Egypt, Iran, the Sudan, and Turkey as well as political information about all Near East countries. Europa Publications Limited, London, published *The Middle East, 1955,* a survey and directory of Arabia, Cyprus, Egypt, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Persia, the Sudan, and Turkey. In it are brief outlines of the constitutions and governmental organizations, including those of regional and local governments. Previous editions were published in 1948, 1950, and 1953.

For background material, *The Evolution of Public Responsibility in the Middle East,* published by the Middle East Institute (Washington, D. C., 1955), is recommended, though the material on government is general rather than specific; it contains a series of addresses presented at the Ninth Annual Conference on Middle East Affairs. Hedley V. Cooke, *Challenge and Response in the Middle East: The Quest for Prosperity, 1919–1951* (New York, 1952) has the same defect, as do Alfred Bonné, *State and Economics in the Near East* (London, 1948); Halford L. Hoskins, *The Middle East* (New York, 1954); Ernest Jackh, ed., *Background of the Middle East* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1952); and Hans Kohn, *A History of Nationalism in the Near East* (New York, 1929).

For a detailed examination of government under the Ottoman Empire, H. A. R. Gibb and Harold Bowen, *Islamic Society and the West,* Vol. I, and *Islamic Society in the Eighteenth Century,* (London, Oxford University Press, 1950) are excellent; as an indispensable tool for research Henry W. Hazard, *Atlas of Islamic History* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1952) is most helpful.

Writings on technical assistance and Point Four programs of the United States government often deal obliquely with local government, although the true significance of this relationship has never yet been fully explored. The March, 1950, issue of the *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* is devoted to Point Four.

In Greece, extensive study of local government was made by the American Mission (ECA) in Athens during the period 1950–52. Articles and pamphlets resulting from this work include several by Harold F. Alderfer: *Facts on Greek Local Government: A Preliminary Outline* (Athens, U. S. ECA Civil Government Division, 1950); *Report on Greek Local Government* (Athens, U. S. Mutual Security Administration, 1952); "United States Aid at the Grass Roots," *National Municipal Review*, April, 1953, pp. 168–171; "Modern Greek Government: The Basic Framework," *Journal of Central European Affairs*, January, 1953, pp. 331–345; and "Modern Greek Government: The Realities," *Journal of Central European Affairs*, April, 1953, pp. 28–46. A volume that provides an excellent political background for the troublesome years since the beginning of World War II is Bickham Sweet-Escott, *Greece: A Political and Economic Survey, 1939–1953* (London, Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1954). The evolution of local government in liberated Greece is outlined in G. T. Bacopoulos, *Outline of the Greek Constitution: Political Systems since the Greek Revolution; Proportional Representation* (Athens, 1950).

Modern local government in Turkey is described in broad outline by Eleanor Bisbee in *The New Turks* (Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1951). Her article, "Test of Democracy in Turkey: Structure of the Turkish Government," in the *Middle East Journal*, April, 1950, pp. 170–182, is enlightening. John M. Donovan, *The Government of Turkey* (Washington, D. C., 1925) describes regional and local government in some detail. E. D. Ellis's article, "The Evolution of Turkish Political Institutions: Internal Developments in Turkey; Political Growth in Turkey, A Case Study," is found in two installments of *Current History:* December, 1947, pp. 347–351, and September, 1948, pp. 95–99. H. A. Reed in the *Foreign Policy Bulletin* of March 15, 1955, discusses "Turkish Democracy at the Cross-roads: Certain Instances of Apparent Political Regressions." The Turkish Information Office supplies a pamphlet *Self-Government in Turkey*. Some information is also available in the *Country Data Book* for Turkey (Washington, D.C., 1950) published by the U. S. Economic Cooperation Administration.

A brochure, *Cyprus Government, Handbook of Information Prepared for Use of the United Kingdom Goodwill Trade Mission,* was issued at Nicosia in Cyprus by the Government Printing Office in 1946.

There is surprisingly little material on Egyptian local government in spite of the long British occupation. J. M. Landan in his *Parliaments and Parties in Egypt* (Israel Publishing House, 1953) deals with the history of parliamentary institutions and political parties and the extent of European influence, providing a good background for further exploration in local institutions of government. Henry Habib Ayront's *The Fellaheen* (Cairo, 1945) gives a sociological and economic picture of village life and its peasants with some side glances at local governing practices.

In the October, 1953, issue of the *Journal of African Administration*, L. M. Buchanan discusses "Local Government in the Sudan since 1947," and in the *Municipal Journal* of January-February, 1954, "Local Government in the

Sudan, the Financial Structure; Difficulties of Recruiting Suitable Staff." R. C. Mayall has an article "Recent Constitutional Developments in the Sudan" in the July, 1952, *International Affairs.*

The most ambitious governmental study of modern Iran or, in fact, of any modern Near East nation is the *Report on Seven Year Development Plan for the Plan Organization of the Imperial Government of Iran* (5 vols., New York, 1949), published by the Overseas Consultants, Inc. Local government, as well as the regional pattern of the national government, is examined in relation to the problem of governmental decentralization. Public health, education, town improvement and planning, low cost housing, water supply, and other local functions are described and analyzed with an eye to recommendations for the future. An earlier American attempt to put Persian government in order is described by A. C. Millspaugh, *Americans in Persia* (Washington, Brookings Institution, 1946).

LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INDIA

R. BHASKARAN
University of Madras

The history of local government in India is divided into three periods: pre-British, British, and since independence. R. K. Mukherji, *Local Government in Ancient India* deals with the first period. C. M. P. Cross, *The Development of Self Government in India, 1858–1914* (Chicago, 1922) discusses the earlier part of the second period, while H. Tinker, *The Foundations of Local Self-Government in India, Pakistan, and Burma* (London, 1954) considers developments down to 1937. Far-reaching changes are taking place as a result of independence, but it is too early to present anything like a full picture. For information in regard to the many significant changes since Indian independence, scholars will have to depend at present on the reports of the state ministries of local government, annual reports issued by the states, newspapers, and the like.

Various public bodies have conducted inquiries into the problems of local government in India; their reports constitute one of the most valuable sources of information. The *Report* of the Indian Statutory Commission of 1930, published by His Majesty's Stationery Office in London, has much to offer students of local government. The *Report* of the Local Self-Government Committee of Bombay (1939), *Report* of the Local Self-Government Committee of the Government of Uttar Pradesh (1940), *Report* of the *Janapada* Enquiry Committee of Madhya Pradesh (1952), and the *Report* of the Uttar Pradesh *Panchayat Raj* Amendment Act Committee (1954) are all worth consulting. The *Report* of the States Enquiry Commission of the Government of India is expected to appear soon and should be a valuable source. The *Report* of the Taxation Enquiry Committee of the Government of India (1955) sheds light on the problem of local government finance.

Other official publications are useful in a study of Indian local government. The annual *Statistical Abstract of India* contains much material on local government. *The Census of India, 1951,* is also useful. Material on local government activities is contained in the annual report of each state; in the annual reports of the state ministries of local government; and in the legal, procedural, and finance manuals published by the states for the use of local government officials. The states publish in a completely codified form the acts and regulations relating to local government bodies within their jurisdictions.

The general literature on Indian local government is not extensive. Several publications deal with the legal aspects of local government; perhaps P. D. Aiyangar, *The Law of Municipal Corporations,* which has appeared in various editions, is as useful as any. Non-legal studies include: H. T. S. Forrest, *The Indian Municipality* (Calcutta, 1909); K. Viswanathan, *A Guide to Panchayat Administration* (1947); M. P. Sharma, *Local Government and Finance in U. P.* (Allahabad, 1946); Hind Kitabs, *Local Self Government in India* (Bombay, 1951); K. T. Shah, *Constitution, Functions and Finance of Indian Municipalities* (Bombay, 1925); J. G. Drummond, *Panchayats in India* (Bombay, 1937); J. Mathai, *Village Government in British India* (London, 1915).

The Local Self-Government Institute at Bombay is the center for various programs relating to local government. Its quarterly journal contains much pertinent information. In 1941 this institute published a much-used *Directory of Local Self-Government in India;* this is now being revised. The *Local Self Government Review,* published in Delhi, is useful; the *Indian Journal of Political Science* contains occasional articles on local government.

PHILIPPINE LOCAL GOVERNMENT

M. LADD THOMAS
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy

Except for a few monographs, little has been published on Philippine local government. Several general works on the Philippines contain some material, usually merely legal descriptions.

Knowledge of its earlier development is prerequisite to understanding contemporary local government. The best single source for the Spanish period is Emma H. Blair and James A. Robinson, eds., *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898* (3 vols., Cleveland, A. H. Clark Co., 1903–09); this collection of translations from Spanish sources includes occasional references to local government. A more compact and detailed description of the organization and finances of towns, *barangays,* and provinces in the nineteenth century can be found in John Foreman, *The Philippine Islands* (New York, Scribner's, 3rd ed., 1906), ch. 13; this chapter also stresses the functions of the Judge Governors, Provincial Civil Governor, *Gobernadorcillo,* and *Cabeza de Barangay.* José P. Laurel, *Local Government in the Philippines* (Manila, La Pilarica Press, 1926) provides an excellent account of local government under the Spanish and through the first two decades of American administration.

American policy aimed at the democratization, Filipinization, and increased efficiency of local government; unfortunately, with somewhat conflicting results. Official reports and recommendations are found in *Reports of the Philippine Commission*, selected items published annually by the Government Printing Office (Washington, D. C.), 1900–15, either as separate documents or as parts of the *Reports of the United States War Department.* Some of this material for the same period is covered in Dean C. Worcester and Joseph R. Hayden, *The Philippines Past and Present* (New York, Macmillan, 1930); here are also two informative chapters on the social structure and administration of the non-Christian tribes. Worcester was Secretary of the Interior of the Philippine Islands, 1901–19, and a member of the Philippine Commission, 1900–13. However, the most scholarly and comprehensive treatment of the structure, problems, and tendencies of local government from 1900 to the Second World War is Hayden, *The Philippines: A Study in National Development* (New York, Macmillan, 1942), chs. 11, 12. Hayden, who was Vice Governor, 1933–35, also analyzes the relation of the local to the central government, emphasizing the trend toward centralization under Quezon.

Two publications necessary for an understanding of the legal status of local government under the Republic are the *Revised Administrative Code of the Philippines* (Manila, Bureau of Printing, 1951), chs. 56–61, and Emiliano P. Cortez, *Provincial and Municipal Law of the Philippines* (Manila, Lawyers Cooperative Publishing Co., 1952). While it contains useful background material on pre-Spanish local government (particularly the early written law codes), the main value of José M. Aruego, *Philippine Government in Action* (Manila, University Publishing Co., Inc., 1954) rests in its extensive coverage, chs. 20–23, of current local government; it relies heavily, however, on the law rather than on actual practice. An attempt to fill this gap is John H. Romani and M. Ladd Thomas, *A Survey of Local Government in the Philippines* (Manila, Institute of Public Administration, University of the Philippines, 1954), based on a field survey using extensive interviews with local officials and citizens. Romani and Thomas are also the authors of the study of local administration in Edwin O. Stene *et al.*, *Public Administration in the Philippines* (Manila, Institute of Public Administration, University of the Philippines, 1955), ch. 4.

While the conditions of the provinces, chartered cities, and municipalities are uniformly unsatisfactory, the village, or *barrio*, is at present considered the major problem of local government. Conditions in the *barrio* are described in Generoso F. Rivera and Robert T. McMillan, *The Rural Philippines* (Manila, U. S. Foreign Operations Administration, 1952); based on field surveys, it includes an analysis of the concentration of economic and political power in a small group, usually of the dominant land-owning class, in each *barrio.* The plight of the *barrio* people and recommendations for government and foreign aid to the *barrio* are the main themes of Roland R. Renne, "Social Unrest and the Barrio Economy," *Philippine Review* (December, 1952). M. Ladd Thomas, "The Philippine Rural Development Program," *Social Research*

(Summer, 1955), outlines President Magsaysay's program to alleviate conditions in the *barrio* and strengthen it administratively. The best recent treatment of the *barrio* is John H. Romani, "The Philippine Barrio," *The Far Eastern Quarterly* (February, 1956).

JAPANESE LOCAL GOVERNMENT

KURT STEINER
Stanford University

The following bibliography is designed to be of use to both Japanese area specialists and those interested in comparative institutions. Thus a special effort has been made to cite as much as possible of the pertinent material in English,[1] and to include many articles written in English while excluding specific citations of similar Japanese material.[2]

1. *Bibliographies:* Material in Western languages is listed in Borton, Eliséeff, Lockwood, and Pelzel, *A Selected List of Books and Articles on Japan* (Cambridge, 1954)[3] and in *The Far Eastern Bibliography*, published until 1954 in each August issue of the *Far Eastern Quarterly*, and since then as a separate issue each September. Those who can read Japanese will find two volumes of the Bibliographical Series of the University of Michigan of great value: John W. Hall, *Japanese History: A Guide to Japanese Reference and Research Material* (Ann Arbor, 1954) emphasizes the period before the Meiji Restoration (1867);[4] Robert E. Ward, *A Guide to Japanese Reference and Research Materials in the Field of Political Science* (Ann Arbor, 1950) includes a list of bibliographies on local government, covering mainly the period 1867–1941. Wartime and postwar research is emphasized in Robert E. Ward, "A Survey of Political Science Literature on Japan," this REVIEW, XLVI (1952), 201–213.[5] Fred W. Riggs, "Notes on Literature Available for the Study of Comparative Public Administration," this REVIEW, XLVIII (1954), 515–537, contains a brief section on Japan.

---

[1] Publications in English or in English and Japanese are cited only by their English title. When a publication appeared only in Japanese, the English translation of the title is given in the text and the Japanese title in a footnote. Japanese personal names are given in the customary Japanese order: i.e., family name first.

[2] No comprehensive study of Japanese local government has been published in any Western language. Kurt Steiner, *Local Government in Japan* (unpublished thesis, Stanford, 1955) is an introductory survey of its historical, legal, political, and sociological aspects. Cecil C. Brett, *The Government of Okayama Prefecture* (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1956) is a valuable case study of local autonomy on the prefectural level.

[3] This work lists the standard bibliographies in English, French, and German.

[4] John W. Hall also wrote "Materials for the Study of Local History in Japan: Pre-Meiji Records," *Occasional Papers*, no. 3, pp. 1–14 (Ann Arbor, Center of Japanese Studies, University of Michigan, 1952).

[5] The last-named three sources are hereafter cited as Hall, *Guide;* Ward, *Guide;* and Ward, "Survey."

The Union of Japanese Societies of Law and Politics publishes annually in English the *Japan Science Review: Law and Politics,* 1950–. The 1951 and 1952 issues took the form of an annotated bibliography; local self-government is treated primarily under administrative law, but the entries are broader than this heading indicates. *A Collection of Opinions on the Reform of the Local Government System,* published by the National Association of City Mayors, contains synopses of articles which appeared in 1951 and 1952, when the Occupation reforms were first subjected to intensive reconsideration.[6] Bibliographies of current publications appear, without annotations, as appendices to various periodicals.

2. *Periodicals:* One of the best of the Japanese periodicals, dealing specifically with local government, is *Municipal Problems,* published by the Tokyo Institute of Municipal Research.[7] It contains articles of high quality, primarily on problems in public administration. Some issues deal with a single topic: e.g., city planning (February, 1954), housing (March, 1954), or problems of newly-established cities (May, 1956). Each number contains a valuable section on current affairs and a topically arranged list of articles in Japanese and western periodicals. Similar in many ways is the *Journal of Municipal Problems,* published in Osaka.[8] *Self-Government Studies* regularly contains articles by officials of the central government, and an appendix summarizing new laws, ordinances, regulations and notifications from the Autonomy Board to the Prefectural governments.[9] A newcomer is the *Collection of Essays on Self-Government,* published by the Self-Government Research Association.[10] Each issue is devoted to a timely topic: e.g., regionalism (October, 1954) or local administrative commissions (March, 1956), with relevant documents and excerpts from periodicals and newspapers in an appendix. The National Association of City Mayors publishes a monthly journal, *City Government,* 1952–.[11] Monthly publications under the auspices of the Autonomy Board are *Local Self-Government,* edited by the Association for the Study of the Local Government System,[12] and *Local Government Times,* edited by the Local Finance Association.[13] Both

---

[6] Zenkoku Shichōkai, *Chihō Seido Kaikaku ni kansuru Ikenshū* (Tokyo, 1952).

[7] The Tokyo Institute of Municipal Research (Tokyo Shisei Chōsakai) was founded in 1922. *Municipal Problems* (*Toshi Mondai*) appears monthly.

[8] The *Journal of Municipal Problems* (*Toshi Mondai Kenkyū*), 1949–, is published by the Association for the Study of Municipal Problems (Toshi Mondai Kenkyūkai,) an organization sponsored by the Osaka Municipal Government. Where a publication shows both a Japanese and an English title—as is the case with the *Journal*—the English title is used in this bibliography, whether it is an exact translation of the Japanese title or not.

[9] *Jichi Kenkyū,* 1925—Monthly. The Autonomy Board (Jichi Chō)—until 1952 known as the Local Autonomy Agency (Chihō Jichi Chō)— is the successor to the Local Affairs Bureau of the defunct Home Ministry, but has fewer legal powers than its predecessor.

[10] *Jichi Ronshū,* May, 1954—Quarterly or Semi-annually. The Self-Government Research Association (Jichi Kenkyūkai) is sponsored by the Osaka Prefectural Government.

[11] Zenkoku Shichōkai, *Shisei.*

[12] Chihō Jichi Seido Kenkyūkai, *Chihō Jichi.*

[13] Chihō Zaimukyōkai, *Jichi Jihō.*

contain articles on current issues. *Local Administration,* a daily newsletter, primarily for local government officials, is published by the Jiji Press.[14]

Periodicals of wider scope often contain articles on local government. The legal aspects are considered in the law reviews,[15] especially the *Public Law Review,* published semi-annually by the Japan Public Law Association;[16] other aspects in *The Journal of the Association of Political and Social Sciences* of Tokyo University,[17] the *Annuals of the Japanese Political Science Association,*[18] the *Waseda Journal of Political Science and Economics,*[19] and the *Sociological Review.*[20] Publications in English which occasionally contain articles on local finance are the *Kyoto University Economic Review* and the *Osaka Economic Papers.*[21]

3. *Yearbooks:* Basic data are in the *Japan Statistical Yearbook,* issued by the Bureau of Statistics in the Prime Minister's Office (in Japanese and English). Statistics are also included in the *Local Autonomy Yearbook,* of particular value for its account of developments during the year, with the gist of legal amendments and of pertinent directives to local officials.[22] The *Municipal Yearbook of Japan* is a treasure house of information.[23]

4. *Historical Material:* The present local government system was built on the system established in the Meiji period. Continuity is apparent on the institutional level and in official attitudes. For historical material, the reader is referred to the above-mentioned *Guides* by Hall and Ward; many of the entries in Ward's *Guide* deal with the prewar system.[24] Material in English

---

[14] Jiji Tsūshinsha, *Chihō Gyōsei.*

[15] A list of law reviews is in Ward's *Guide,* pp. 20, 43 ff. See also Hall's *Guide,* p. 71 f. and *Japan Science Review,* no. 3, (1952), pp. vii-ix. A new law journal, *Jurist* (Jurisuto), 1952—, appears twice monthly.

[16] Nihon Kōhō Gakkai, *Kōhō Kenkyū,* 1949—. The topically arranged surveys of recent contributions to the field of public law are especially useful. The issue of October, 1953 (no. 9), contains a symposium on local government.

[17] Kokka Gakkai, *Kokka Gakkai Zasshi,* 1887—, monthly.

[18] The Japanese Political Science Association (Nihon Seiji Kakkai), founded in 1948, is a nationwide organization. The *Annals* (*Seiji Gakkai Nempō*) reflects recent trends in political science research in Japan.

[19] *Waseda Seiji Keizaigaku Zasshi,* 1925—, monthly. A special number which appeared in English in October, 1952, contained articles on the "Development of Local Self-Government in Japan" by Sato Tatsuo and "The Problem of Special Cities in Japan" by Goto Ichiro.

[20] Nihon Shakai Gakkai, *Shakaigaku Hyōron,* 1950—. Monthly.

[21] Published by the Economics Departments of Kyoto and Osaka University respectively. On local finance, see, e.g., Kambe Masao, "Independence of Local Finance," *Kyoto University Economic Review,* XXIV (1954), 1–15, and Kinoshita Kazuo, "Current Problems of Local Finance in Japan," *Osaka Economic Papers,* II (1954), 41–52.

[22] The *Local Autonomy Yearbook* (*Chihō Jichi Nenkan*) is edited by the Local Autonomy Research Association (Chihō Jichi Kenkyūkai), which consists primarily of members of the Autonomy Board. It is published by the Jiji Press.

[23] *Nihon Toshi Nenkan,* edited by the Tokyo Institute of Municipal Research and, since 1955 (Vol. 17), published by the National Association of City Mayors.

[24] An outstanding account of the establishment of the Meiji local government system and its subsequent development is *History of Fifty Years of Local Self-Government* (*Jichi*

is in Walter W. McLaren, "Japanese Government Documents," *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, Vol. 42 (1914).[25] Okuma Shigenobu, *Fifty Years of New Japan* (New York, 1909) includes an essay on local government by S. Shimizu. There is a chapter on local administration in Harold S. Quigley, *Japanese Government and Politics* (New York, 1932); Hugh Borton, *The Administration and Structure of the Japanese Government* (Department of State Publication 2244, Far Eastern Series 8, 1945) shows the development from 1937 to 1945. Oda Yorodzu, *Principes de droit administratif du Japon* (Paris, 1928) also deals with local administration (pp. 176–223 and *passim*). A case study, now of historical interest, is Charles A. Beard, *The Administration and Politics of Tokyo: A Survey and Opinion* (New York, 1923).

5. *Legal Material:* The text of laws, ordinances, and regulations is published in the *Official Gazette*. A *Supplement to the Official Gazette* contains the records of the proceedings of both Houses of the Diet. For the convenience of occupation officials, the *Official Gazette* and the *Supplement* for the period from May, 1946, to April, 1952, appeared also in an English edition;[26] various governmental agencies also published English translations of the laws and ordinances regarding their functions. Thus the Prime Minister's Office issued in 1948 a loose-leaf booklet, *Laws Concerning Local Autonomy*, kept up to date by insertion sheets until 1951. The Local Autonomy Agency and the Local Finance Commission published an English version of the *Local Tax Law* (with some related laws) in 1950. A number of collections of laws are available in official and private editions:[27] e.g., the privately published *Compendium of Local Government Laws*.[28]

For the legislative history of the Occupation reform and of subsequent measures, the records of the appropriate Diet committees—especially the Imperial Constitution Amendment Draft Committee and the Local Administration Committee of both Houses—are important. They are published by the Bureau of the House in question.[29] Pertinent court decisions may be found in

---

Gojūnen Shi), published by the Tokyo Institute of Municipal Research in 1941. The compiler of this work, Kikegawa Hiroshi, published his later research in a series of articles, "The Process of the Establishment of the Meiji Local Government System" ("Meiji Chihō Seido Seiritsu Katei"), in *Municipal Problems*, beginning in August, 1953 (Vol. 44, No. 8).

[25] Most books on recent Japanese history refer to the establishment of the Meiji local government system. See, e.g., McLaren's *Political History of Japan During the Meiji Era: 1867–1913* (New York, 1916) and Chitoshi Yanaga, *Japan Since Perry* (New York, 1949).

[26] For detailed information on the *Official Gazette* (*Kampō*) and the *Supplement to the Official Gazette* (*Kampō Gōgai*), see Ward, *Guide*, pp. 75 ff, and "Survey," p. 206. From September, 1953, to February, 1954, a private company, the International Public News Agency in Tokyo, published excerpts from the *Official Gazette* in English under the title, *Japan's Official Gazette*.

[27] For a description of these collections, see Ward, *Guide*, p. 68.

[28] Gakuyōshobō, *Chihō Jichi Roppō*. The collections of laws have the six basic codes as their core and are thus known as *Roppō Zensho* (Compendium of the Six Codes).

[29] *Teikoku Kempō Kaisei An Iinkaigiroku* and *Chihō Gyōsei Iiinkaigiroku.*

the *Supreme Court Reports*[30] and in the *Collection of Precedents and Cases Relating to Local Government,* published in loose-leaf form by the Autonomy Board.[31]

From time to time special commissions have been established by law to submit proposals for local government reform. The Local Administration Investigation Committee was created in 1949, on the basis of a recommendation of the so-called Shoup Mission.[32] Headed by Kambe Masao, it submitted its *Recommendation Concerning Redistribution of Administrative Affairs* in 1950.[33] Although the recommendations were shelved, they illuminate a problem of paramount and continuing importance. After the Occupation, the Japanese government began to revise the Occupation-sponsored reforms and a Local System Investigation Council was instituted. Its reports, 1953–, have been implemented in many cases by subsequent legislation.[34]

Prefectures and larger cities publish their by-laws in printed form and the proceedings of their assemblies in printed or mimeographed form. A classified loose-leaf compilation of prefectural by-laws edited by the Autonomy Board is available under the title *Collection of Local Government By-Laws.*[35] Some prefectures also publish topical compilations of their by-laws and insertion sheets at various intervals. Almost all local entities publish basic data on history, population, schools, budget, etc., under the title *Outline of the Government of. . . .*[36]

6. *Secondary Material on the Post-war System:* The Occupation gave an official account of its endeavors from 1945 to 1948 in the report of Government Section, SCAP, *Political Reorientation of Japan* (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1949). The first, narrative volume contains a section on local government (pp. 260–289). The second volume, a collection of documents, includes translations of the various constitution drafts—omitting significantly the original Government Section draft—and of some of the basic laws. All these laws have been amended repeatedly since.

[30] *Saikō Saibansho Hanreishū; Gyōsei Jiken Saiban Reishū,* both monthly.

[31] Jichi Chō, Gyōseibu, *Chihō Jichi Kankei Jitsurei Hanreishū,* 1951—.

[32] *The Report on Japanese Taxation by the Shoup Mission* (4 vols.) was published by SCAP in September, 1949. A supplementary *Second Report on Japanese Taxation* is available in an edition by the Japan Tax Association. Both are in English and Japanese. The Mission made recommendations on the tax system in general and on local functions and finances in particular. The Autonomy Board publishes a yearly *Report on the State of Local Finance* (*Chihō Zaisei no Jōkyō Hōkoku*); also the *Autonomy Monthly Report* (*Jichi Geppō*), containing regulations and statistics.

[33] Chihō Gyōsei Chōsa Iin Kaigi, *Gyōsei Jimu Saihaibun ni Kansuru Kankoku* (Tokyo, 1950).

[34] The Council (Chihō Seido Chōsakai) published its first *Report concerning the Reform of the Local Government System* (*Chihō Seido no Kaikaku ni kansuru Tōshin*) in October, 1953. For a critical analysis, see *Municipal Problems,* Vol. 44, no. 11 (November, 1953).

[35] Jichi Chō, Gyōseika, *Chihō Jichi Jōrei Shū,* published by the Teikoku Chihō Gyōsei Gakkai (Tokyo, 1951).

[36] *Ken* (*Shi, Chō, Son*) *Gaiyō,* preceded by the name of the local entity.

Books on the Occupation deal with the local government reforms only tangentially.[37] However, American scholars have written articles on aspects of local government. Ralph J. D. Braibanti dealt with "Executive Power in the Japanese Prefectural Government" and with "Neighborhood Associations in Japan and Their Democratic Potentialities."[38] Paul S. Dull, "The Political Structure of a Japanese Village," *Far Eastern Quarterly*, XIII (1954), 175–190, is a case study that goes beyond the legal institutions. Kurt Steiner discussed "The Japanese Village and Its Government," *Far Eastern Quarterly*, XV (1956), 185–199; he outlined Occupation and post-Occupation developments in "Local Government in Japan: Reform and Reaction," *Far Eastern Survey*, XIII (1954), 97–102. Robert E. Ward contributed to our understanding of Japanese political behavior in "The Socio-Political Role of the Buraku (Hamlet) in Japan," this REVIEW, XLV (1951), 1025–1040, and in "Patterns of Stability and Change in Rural Japanese Politics," *Occasional Papers*, No. 1, pp. 1–6 (1951). He described village government in "Some Observations of Local Autonomy at the Village Level in Present-Day Japan," *Far Eastern Quarterly*, XII (1953), 183–202. George A. Warp published two critical articles in the *National Municipal Review*, XLI, XLII: "Americanization in Japan" (October, 1952) and "In Our Image and Likeness" (April, 1953).

Japanese writing on the postwar system has been prolific. An early reform provided for election of the hitherto appointed prefectural governors; in view of present endeavors to return to appointment, Nagahama Masatoshi's brief study on *Various Problems Concerning the Public Election of Governors* is still timely.[39] Perhaps the best commentary on the present constitution, with a chapter on local government, is the *Annotated Constitution of Japan*, edited by the Juridical Society of Tokyo University.[40] Very useful discussions of local government are included in all texts on constitutional and administrative law.[41] A monograph on the *Constitution and Local Self-Government* was published by Yanase Yoshimoto.[42] Sugimura Shozaburo wrote *An Outline of the Local Self-Government System.*[43] Besides the academicians, some practitioners must be mentioned.[44] Nagano Shiro, *Local Autonomy Law Article by Article—Interpretation and Application* is a comprehensive commentary.[45]

---

[37] It is impossible to mention all these books here. The Institute of Pacific Relations published Edwin M. Martin, *The Allied Occupation of Japan* (New York, 1948) and Robert A. Fearey, *The Occupation of Japan, Second Phase: 1948–50* (New York, 1950). Harry Emerson Wildes, *Typhoon in Tokyo* (New York, 1955) is a critical but not always reliable appraisal. Harold S. Quigley and John E. Turner, *The New Japan: Government and Politics* (Minneapolis, 1956) contains a chapter on local government (pp. 377–406), an excellent introduction to the subject.

[38] *Far Eastern Quarterly*, IX (1950), 231–244, and VII (1948), 136–164. Braibanti's view on neighborhood associations contrasts with that of John Masland, "Neighborhood Associations in Japan," *Far Eastern Survey*, XV (1946), 355–358. See also the Tokyo Metropolitan Government's *Report on a Survey regarding the Actual Condition of Neighborhood Associations* (*Chōkai, Jichikai nado Jittai Chōsa Hōkokusho*) (Tokyo, 1956).

[39] Nagahama Masatoshi, *Chiji Kōsen no Shomondai* (Tokyo, 1946). His *Local Self-Government* (*Chihō Jichi*) is a brief but perceptive study of its development.

[40] Hōgaku Kyōkai, *Chūkai Nihonkoku Kempō*. The second edition (1954) deals with the constitutional provisions on local government, Vol. 2, pt. 2.

[41] Some post-war texts are cited in Ward, *Guide*, pp. 71 ff, and "Survey," pp. 207 f. For recent works, see the *Japan Science Review*.

A number of books deal with the revision of the postwar reforms. Hara Ryonosuke *et al., Problematical Points of the Local Government Reform* and Royama Masamichi, *The Reform of the Local Government System* contain excellent expositions of the problems and proposals for their solution.[46] Some fifty authorities contributed to the *Collection of Essays on Local Autonomy,* published under the auspices of the Autonomy Board by the Local Finance Association.[47] Tsuji Kiyoaki, *Studies of the Japanese Bureaucracy,* deals with the present revisionist trend in a very suggestive chapter, "Natural Reaction and Political Reaction."[48]

Space prohibits discussion of the literature on more specific topics. But the voluminous work of Fujita Takeo must be mentioned, because his special field—local finance—is of fundamental importance and because he shows effectively its connection with the issue of centralization.[49]

7. *Field Surveys, Community Studies, and Public Opinion Polls:* In a country which comparatively recently adopted institutions developed in a different cultural context, divergences between law and actuality are particularly significant. Thus sociological material is of special interest. Fortunately, American and Japanese scholars have become increasingly interested in community studies. Richard K. Beardsley's thoughtful article "Community Studies in Japan," *Far Eastern Quarterly,* XIV (1954), 37–55, covers the work done by both up to now.[50] Specifically focused on the political behavior of the Japanese peasantry is Royama Masamichi, *Transformation of Self-Government*

---

[42] Yanase Yoshimoto, *Kempō to Chihō Jichi* (Tokyo, 1954). The new constitutional provisions on local government are also widely discussed in periodicals. Yanase Yoshimoto, Sugimura Shozaburo, Tanaka Jiro, Ukai Nobushige, Hara Ryonosuke, Kaino Michitaka, and others have contributed widely divergent views.

[43] Sugimura Shozaburo, *Chihō Jichisei Kōyō* (Tokyo, 1951).

[44] See, e.g., Suzuki Shunichi, *Local Self-Government System* (*Chihō Jichi Seido*) and Takatsuji Masami, *The Standard of Local Administrative Affairs* (*Chihō Gyōsei Jimu Kihan*), both published in Tokyo, 1951. Mr. Suzuki is Vice-Chief of the Autonomy Board.

[45] Nagano Shiro, *Chikujō Chihō Jichi Hō-Kaishaku to sono Unyō* (Tokyo, 1953).

[46] Hara Ryonosuke *et al., Chihō Seido Kaikaku no Mondaiten,* and Royama Masamichi, *Chihō Seido no Kaikaku,* both published in Tokyo, 1953. A recent book by Tanaka Jiro also has the title *Chihō Seido Kaikaku no Mondaiten* (Tokyo, 1956).

[47] Chihō Zaimukyōkai, *Chihō Jichi Rombunshū* (Tokyo, 1954). The occasion for this publication was the first anniversary of the Law for the Promotion of Amalgamations of Towns and Villages, a major development in Japanese local government.

[48] Tsuji Kiyoaki, *Nippon Kanryōsei no Kenkyū* (Tokyo, 1953).

[49] See, e.g., Fujita Takeo, *An Essay on Japanese Local Finance* (*Nihon Chihō Zaisei Ron*) (Tokyo, 1943) and *History of the Development of Japanese Local Finance* (*Nihon Chihō Zaisei Hattatsu Shi*) (Tokyo, 2nd ed., 1951).

[50] Almost all studies deal with rural communities. In the field of urban sociology, see the writings of Isomura Eiichi, especially his *Urban Sociology* (*Toshi Shakaigaku*) (Tokyo, 1953).

in Agricultural Villages.[51] Surveys of attitudes toward local self-government have been published by the National Public Opinion Institute and by various local entities.[52] Particularly useful are investigations of the actual operation of newly created or reformed institutions, such as that of the Institute of Social Sciences of Tokyo University, *The Administrative Commission: Its Theory, History, and Actuality,*[53] and the joint publication of the National Association of Chairmen of City Assemblies and the Osaka Government Research Institute on *An Investigation of the Actual Conditions of Local Assemblies.*[54] Studies of this type depart from the traditional legal-historical approach and promise new insights into Japanese government and politics on both the local and national level.

---

[51] Royama Masamichi, *Nōson Jichi no Hembō* (Tokyo, 1948). There are notes on village government and politics in Andrew J. Grad, *Land and Peasant in Japan* (mimeogr., New York, 1952).

[52] See, e.g., Kokuritsu Seron Chōsajo, *Chihō Jichi ni kansuru Seron Chōsa* (1951) and *Chihō Jichi ni tsuite no Seron Chōsa* (1952); Tokyo-To, Sōmukyoku, *Tokyo Tosei ni tsuite* (1954); and Toshi Mondai Kenkyū, (Bessatsu), *Osaka-shi ni okeru Toshi Gyōsei ni kansuru Seron Chōsa* (March, 1954).

[53] Tokyo Daigaku, Shakai Kagaku Kenkyūjo, *Gyōsei Iiinkai: Riron, Rekishi, Jittai* (Tokyo, 1951).

[54] Zenkoku Shi Gikai Gichōkai, Osaka Shisei Kenkyūjo, *Chihō Gikai no Jittai Chōsa* (Osaka, 1954).

BOOK REVIEWS

A Preface to Democratic Theory. By Robert A. Dahl. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1956. Pp. 155. $3.00.)

Although modern political scholarship has paid unceasing attention to the theory and operation of democratic government, a number of questions essential to its understanding and performance remain as unsettled as ever. Where, for example, ought the power of decision to lie amid the conflicting demands of minorities and majorities? Under what conditions could a majority claim the right to enforce policies intensely distasteful to a legitimate minority? What restraints are needed if majorities, minorities, or those who govern in their name, are to be prevented from gross usurpations of power—indeed, from tyranny itself? What are the logical and empirical preconditions for the operation of a viable democracy?

These are the kinds of questions to which Professor Dahl addresses himself in this remarkably compact and tightly reasoned new book on democratic theory, given originally in lecture form for the Walgreen Foundation. In his approach he skillfully blends into a single admirable product the traditional methods of textual examination, the techniques of systematic or "formal" analysis (including symbolic demonstrations of key logical relations), and, finally, a hard-headed appraisal of the empirical realities. Political theory is approached not merely as an *a priori* enterprise, without obligation to the facts of life, but as a union of normative and empirical considerations in which the latter serve to qualify the former. The method might be described as systematic model-building, in which the model is assessed, reshaped, and made "operational" through reference to the empirical realities. The result is a work of considerable presence and vitality, sophisticated about method to a degree that most political scientists might well strive to emulate.

If Professor Dahl had done nothing more than demonstrate the value of his approach, pointing political theory to a possible new stage in its development, we should have reason enough to be grateful. But the substantive aspects of his contribution are as fresh and as compelling as the methods he has employed. He directs his attention mainly to three theoretical models (among the several which, he points out, could have been chosen) and subjects each of them to an intensive systematic and descriptive analysis. The first, *Madisonian democracy*, represents an effort "to bring off a compromise between the power of majorities and the power of minorities, between the political equality of all adult citizens on the one side and the desire to limit their sovereignty on the other." This has been the theory most preferred by Americans, for its emphasis on constitutional checks designed to disperse authority has seemed to them the surest defense against tyranny. Dahl finds the theory deficient both in the descriptive status of some of its assumptions and in the logic by which it is led to its conclusions. The Madisonian theory, he says, fails to demonstrate that tyranny will ensue if power is concentrated; nor has it shown that frequent elections are by themselves insufficient to prevent the destruction of the republic. The theory so exaggerates the importance of formal constitutional checks that it neglects to give scope to the numerous informal social restraints to be found in every pluralistic society. The safety of democracy, Dahl argues, must rest in the successful internalizing of restraints, in the conscience and predispositions of society's members, not in a complicated network of external checks such as judicial review, staggered terms of office, or the presidential veto.

The second model examined is *populistic democracy*, which identifies democracy with political equality, popular sovereignty, and, most important, the unrestrained power of majorities. This theory, which attempts to provide a procedural rule for the perfect attainment of equality and popular sovereignty, is in reality no more than an "exercise in axiomatics," essentially lacking in empirical relevance. It is a theory plagued by numerous difficulties: e.g., it assumes that only one alternative will be preferred by a majority at any given time when in fact several alternatives may be equally preferred; it ignores the problem of intensity and would permit a small majority with weak preferences to override the desires of a large minority with strong preferences; it postulates only two goals to be maximized while others of equal importance are discounted or sacrificed; it ignores the fact that in reality a minority rules so that in practice unlimited power would be bestowed upon a few; etc.

The third model, *polyarchal democracy*, combines elements from the two preceding theories but differs from them in concentrating not on the goals to be maximized but on the common properties exhibited by democratic organizations, in order that the conditions for the existence of democracy may be meaningfully elaborated. In addition to such prerequisites as free voting, equal weighting of votes, the opportunity to insert new preferences into the set of alternatives being offered the electorate, and possession by each individual of identical information about the alternatives, the polyarchal theory places emphasis on a high rate of political activity and on social training in the norms of the system so as to maximize consensus about them. Polyarchy stresses the social rather than the constitutional prerequisites for a democratic order.

The final sections of the book assess American politics in the light of the conditions for democracy previously set forth. The American system is perceived as a hybrid, and a very successful one. Like a polyarchy, which it approximates in certain respects, it permits "all active and legitimate groups in the population [to] make themselves heard at some crucial stage in the process of decision." In this "markedly decentralized system" in which decisions are made by "endless bargaining," there is perhaps less order than in other systems, but it is nevertheless not so defective as its critics make out. It possesses great virtue, furthermore, in mediating the conflicting interests of a highly diverse population, permitting minorities of almost every description to enter into the public debate and influence the outcome. Partly for this reason it reinforces agreement and encourages moderation in a highly complex and rapidly evolving society.

The inadequacy of the foregoing summary can be appreciated only if the reader turns to the volume itself. No brief *résumé* can satisfactorily communicate the sense of mastery which the book conveys, the lucidity and skill with which the argument is developed, and the extraordinary felicity of the prose. Much less can a brief review do justice to the numerous fresh and compelling insights which are met at every stage. Certain aspects of the work have not even been touched upon here, such as the very exciting analysis of preference intensity and its measurement—one of the most original contributions in the book.

Some readers will doubtless find that they do not share all the views that are central to the argument. For example, Madisonian theory seems to me less vulnerable, on either logical or empirical grounds, than it does to the author. Then, too, I would assign greater importance to the role of constitutional restraints as checks against political aggrandizement and tyranny, for "social restraints" may not always be adequate: some attacks on democracy may be successfully met only by recourse to constitutional devices. More important, the argument overlooks the degree to which formal restraints help to define and maintain the social norms which eventually become "internalized." No less than the family or any other social institution, the legal arrangements serve to shape the citizen conscience.

Other disagreements could be stated, but none is sufficient to detract significantly from the importance of the book. It is a unique and unusually intelligent contribution to the literature of political science in general, and, more specifically, to a branch of the field which seems badly in need of new ways of thinking about its oldest and most traditional problems.

HERBERT MCCLOSKY.

Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

Feudalism in History. EDITED BY RUSHTON COULBORN. WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY JOSEPH R. STRAYER, EDWIN O. REISCHAUER, DERK BODDE, BURR C. BRUNDAGE, RUSHTON COULBORN, WILLIAM F. EDGERTON, DANIEL THORNER, ERNST H. KANTOROWICZ, AND MARC SZEFTEL. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1956. Pp. xiv, 438. $8.50.)

The present volume is the outgrowth of a conference held at Princeton, October 31–November 1, 1950. Its aim is described as being that of "testing the extent of repetition in history." Whether feudalism was the best phenomenon for such a test may be doubted; in terms of his own definition, the main author and editor, Professor Rushton Coulborn, finds only two *bona fide* feudalisms in history: namely, that of Western Europe (discussed by Joseph R. Strayer) and that of Japan (E. O. Reischauer). His collaborators also deal with "feudalism" in China (Derk Bodde), in Ancient Mesopotamia and Iran (Burr C. Brundage), in Ancient Egypt (William F. Edgerton), in India (Daniel Thorner), in Byzantium (Ernst H. Kantorowicz), and in Russia (Marc Szeftel), but the conclusion appears to be that in none of these can feudalism be definitely shown to have occurred. In spite of this, but for no very clear reason, Coulborn remains convinced that feudalism is "a peculiarly useful example" of uniformities in history and that feudalism is "obviously one of the major uniformities in history." Coulborn himself engages, in his concluding section, in some general speculations about the possibility that feudalism may have been an important factor in the early history of civilization, but he himself stresses that all this is purely hypothetical and so of no great interest to the empirical student of society and government.

And yet, in spite of these predominantly negative conclusions, an extremely interesting and valuable study has resulted. There can be little doubt that what one has been able to put together here as an empirical theory of feudalism and its place in history is of decisive importance to any student of comparative government who recognizes the importance of historical perspective in this field. In order to give a brief hint of the book's value, it is necessary to quote the author's general concept of feudalism in terms of static and dynamic elements. "The static criteria include those of vassal-lord relationships . . . ; a personalized government which is most effective on the local level . . . ; heredity of functions; a system of landholding consisting of fiefs given in return for service; regularization of the rights of the lord over the peasant; existence of private armies; and a code of honor in which military obligations are stressed. The dynamic criteria include those of an antecedent empire which has disintegrated; the impact of barbarian invasion; the outstripping of economic unity by political unity, leading to waning of central authority and rise of local magnates; monopolization of military techniques by a special group; warfare as a means of building larger political units out of lesser ones; and the existence of a universal religion which makes of the feudal period an "age of faith" (p. 199). Certainly Reischauer's incisive account of feudalism in Japan has no difficulty with this conceptual framework. Unusual in this description is the stress on the antecedent empire and the barbarians. The authors consider the role of the barbarian in the development of feudalism crucial; he is "the key man" (p. 181). For it is the barbarian leader of a war band, of a *comitatus*, who reconstitutes a tottering empire by setting up the feudal relationship in what the authors call a proto-feudal regime. "Proto-feudal and feudal Europe expanded to take in great numbers of new barbarians, as proto-feudal and feudal Japan did, because it is the nature of such systems to expand." The conclusion is drawn that barbarians can be involved in the rise of feudalism at two different, though overlapping, times: namely, in the early days of the disintegration of the old state, and later again, when new barbarians are drawn into the society as it expands. "This is as true of Europe as it is of Japan . . . " (p. 210).

The recognition of the crucial role of the barbarian in the establishment of feudalism leads to the conclusion that feudalism is essentially a process whereby a disintegrating society is rejuvenated and revived—enters as it were a new life cycle. Amidst the chaos and the ever-present threat of disaster the "strong elemental fief" is constructed by strong and ruthless military leaders as a haven of peace and quiet amidst the tossing seas. Coulborn and his associates are not prepared to claim that feudalism has, besides this "reconstituting" role, also a decisive role to play in the *constituting* of civilized societies, although in his brilliant concluding analysis Coulborn makes out a good speculative case for a working hypothesis to this effect. In any case, the feudal relationship "forced subordinates to learn and carry out their political functions, and taught superiors the more difficult lesson that their survival and fortune depended on their discharging their own political duty to their subordinates. The personal feudal relationship may be regarded, in fact, as one of the ultimate, completely simple elements with which a political system can be put together" (p. 214). It is a relationship modeled upon the loyalty and devotion of the gang to its leader, suggesting intriguing parallels with the structure of personal relations among the "elite" in the Fascist totalitarian movements.

There seems to be some difference of opinion between the authors on the range and significance of feudalism. Derk Bodde suggests that perhaps the authors are a bit too emphatic in their stress on the governmental side of feudalism. Perhaps a common feature of feudalism is "binding the peasant so closely to the particular land he cultivates as to make him little better than the serf of his landlord proprietor" (p. 91). This view of feudalism is certainly widespread. It would be tempting to explore further the ideas on religion in relation to feudalism and the general notions on cultural growth and change which Coulborn sketches in his concluding "Comparative Study." From the viewpoint of the student of empirical history and government these speculations in the manner of Toynbee are, properly speaking, philosophy of history. One notes certain curious omissions, both in the notes and in the, on the whole, excellent bibliography.

This brief sketch of necessity does less than justice to the extraordinary richness of both material and analysis which *Feudalism* contains. We also have omitted certain minor criticisms which suggest themselves: e.g., concerning the confusion between German and Germanic, the tortured interpretation of the subjects of post-medieval German states as "nations," the confused and undefined use of such terms as "ideology," and the proposition that "feudal politics stood outside the sphere of religion" (p. 370). Generally speaking, one misses a bit the touch of comparative government and political theory. More serious perhaps is the complete absence of any consideration of the basic work of Otto von Gierke (and of Olivier-Martin) whose elaboration of the dichotomy of *Herrschaft* and *Genossenschaft* could have contributed basic insights. But after all such critical remarks are made and elaborated, the fact remains that *Feudalism* is a significant achievement, and one which students of comparative government can ill afford to neglect. No one hereafter can be excused if he uses the term "feudalism" in the vague and journalistic way in which it has been used until recently by many authors even as learned and acute as Thorstein Veblen. In this sense, the volume is undoubtedly a landmark in the development of comparative and theoretical work in history and government.

CARL J. FRIEDRICH.

Harvard University.

The Gold Coast in Transition. BY DAVID APTER. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1955. Pp. xiii, 355. $5.00.)

This is the first book-length study of postwar political developments in an

African territory by an American political scientist. It is also the first systematic case study of what the author rightly states to be one of the crucial issues of our time: namely, "can a political system such as ours in the West be satisfactorily adjusted to the needs of aspiring peoples in underdeveloped areas in Africa?" In terms of subject matter, it is a timely, significant, and important book; in terms of methodology, it is a work which will provoke considerable debate.

The central focus of Apter's study is what he calls "political institutional transfer" as it has taken place in the Gold Coast, the most politically advanced of all tropical African territories. By such transfer he does not mean simply the introduction of political structures of the British parliamentary system, but the more fundamental processes of bringing about changes in public attitudes and political behavior. His central proposition is that the charismatic authority of Prime Minister Kwame Nkrumah, by satisfying the "functional requisites" of traditional leadership among the Ashanti peoples, has been an effective vehicle for endowing the new central parliamentary institutions with a legitimacy recognized by a substantial body of Gold Coast public opinion.

There are certain questions which might be raised regarding this main thesis. One of these would be the extent to which the functions attributed to the Akan chiefs of Ashanti are typical, exhaustive, or really "requisite." Again, assuming that these functions are at least characteristic of the Akan systems as found in Ashanti, to what extent has Nkrumah's charismatic authority effectively replaced the functions of traditional authorities in the political systems of other groups in the Gold Coast from which Nkrumah received very considerable support? The Ewe, for example, are prominent in Nkrumah's entourage, but the pattern of traditional authority among the Ewe is quite different from that of the Ashanti. Finally, there may be much validity in the concept of "charisma" as applied to the peculiar role of Nkrumah *vis-à-vis* at least certain groups in the Gold Coast, but is charisma a necessary ingredient for effective "political institutional transfer"? Developments in Western and Northern Nigeria and in Sierra Leone suggest other possible patterns. These are examples of the types of questions which might be raised by this very suggestive pioneering study.

In addition to his admirable effort to go beyond the formal legal approach to political developments and to probe deeply into the complexities of social change in the Gold Coast, Apter's study has many other features to commend it. His descriptions are accurate and clearly based upon a keen grasp of the essentials of Gold Coast history, tribal cultures, and contemporary politics. His interpretations are balanced and objective; indeed, the study in general is rigorously neutral as regards the relative virtues of British administration and the Gold Coast movement for national "FreeDom." He recognizes, indeed he emphasizes and demonstrates, that in the study of contemporary African politics one cannot find "purely political" elements, and that one is heavily dependent upon the insights and techniques of the anthropologist. His study illuminates in striking fashion the role and significance of traditional elements in African political development.

This study should command the attention of persons falling roughly into two groups. One group would include those persons having a special interest in African affairs, such as colonial administrators, educated Africans, and the growing number of European and American scholars and officials, and informed citizens, concerned with African political developments. The second group would include those social scientists, including professional Africanists, having a special intellectual interest in methodology and social theory. Many of those in the first group—the likely "general readers" of this book—will find certain parts rather difficult to read. Indeed, there are some concepts and passages which will be fully comprehended only by those acquainted with the works and the special language of Max Weber, Talcott Parsons, and Marion J. Levy, Jr. This is unfortunate, not only because the rapid advance of the Gold Coast toward self-government has created a wide demand for a descriptive and interpretative account along more conventional lines, but also because there lies behind the unfamiliar concepts and terminological innovations of the author a depth of insight regarding the really critical issues involved in African developments which should be communicated to and comprehended by as wide as audience as possible.

The second group, those social scientists particularly interested in methodology and social theory, will find this study especially challenging. It is primarily to this group that Apter's study is addressed. Indeed, his theoretical and methodological emphasis partly explains the use of his special vocabulary, which will tend to discourage the general reader. Given the two audiences interested in his study it might have been better in the balance if Apter had written two books or, alternatively, if the present book had been divided into two parts—one, largely descriptive, for the general reader, and the other, mainly theoretical, for the social theorists. His general conceptual and analytical framework is set forth in a tightly-written Appendix and should be studied very carefully before one proceeds to the body of the work.

The study falls squarely in the center of the Great Debate among social theorists regarding the validity and utility of structural-functional requisite analysis. However, unlike certain proponents of the structural-functional "school," he has undertaken to subject his methodological framework and analytical categories to the test of a concrete field situation. He has approached this task pragmatically, insisting that the crux of such a test is "whether or not, at the end, our understanding of complex socio-political phenomena has been improved." Certainly, some of the more general criticisms of the structural-functional approach (i.e., that it tends to be static and conservative, or that its users are "neo-scholastic" prisoners "filling boxes") are not valid in regard to the study under review.

There are some members of the profession—those less attracted to schematization and methodological elegance—who might argue that the same results could have been achieved, and perhaps expressed in far more readable prose, without the elaborate conceptual and analytical apparatus employed in this study. While many points in the analysis might have been expressed in simpler language, and while there is always a danger of becoming a prisoner or a crusader for a system, it is questionable whether a less systematic approach would have come to grips, as Apter's study has done, with crucial elements in the traditional authority structures which tend either to facilitate or to retard the development of a modern secular political system. It is difficult to see how one can determine the degree of "detribalization" or "breakdown of traditional authority," to use the *clichés* characteristic of most other writings on African affairs, without systematic comparison of the functions performed by a traditional authority system at different points in a time series. It is significant that Apter's conclusions and forecasts of probable future developments have been, in the main, sustained or, at least, not proved wrong, by the many dramatic events which have occurred since his study was completed. Given the volatile character of contemporary Gold Coast politics this fact alone attests to the shrewdness of the author's insight and analysis.

JAMES S. COLEMAN.

University of California (Los Angeles).

America Votes—A Handbook of Contemporary American Election Statistics. COMPILED AND EDITED BY RICHARD M. SCAMMON. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1956. Pp. 422. $12.50.)

On July 14, 1956, Mel Parnell of the Boston Red Sox pitched himself to fame with a no-hit, 4–0 triumph over the Chicago White Sox. The news stories immediately reported the details of Parnell's up-and-down baseball career (he had lost eight consecutive games to the White Sox since last beating them on May 5, 1953) along with reflections on comparable no-hit feats. The last Red Sox to turn the trick, it seemed, was Howard Ehmke in 1923; the last Red Sox *lefthander* to do it (Parnell is one) was Dutch Leonard in 1916; the last pitcher to do it in Fenway Park (the scene of Parnell's glory) was Ernie Shore in 1917. Abundant other particulars were available, including the score, which obligingly in all cases was also 4–0.

The followers of the sports pages take all this for granted, accustomed as we in America have become to the precise recording of athletic events. Men of business see nothing extraordinary in it either, depending as they do on the infinite variety of production, trade, and financial information put at their finger tips daily by public and private agencies. The student of American politics can react in only one way: with envy.

No one who has not himself tried to study comprehensively American nominations and elections can quite grasp the inadequacy of our electoral statistics. For more than a year in one state the official tabulation of a recent presidential election disappeared, with no copies extant. In one of the largest metropolitan areas officials successively provided a professor with four conflicting sets of ward returns, the second finally being tapped as the best one. In at least two other states the county results of important elections formerly were not available for distribution, even in mimeographed form. In many places the inaccessibility of returns for past elections has confined the study of voting behavior to those students able to stand the tedium and cost of an extensive exercise in compilation.

These primitive conditions have spurred political scientists for more than a decade to an active campaign for some sort of system to preserve and publish American electoral statistics. Numerous individuals, committees, and organizations have invested countless hours (and some very countable dollars) in the task. The end result of it all is Volume I of Richard M. Scammon's *America Votes—A Handbook of Contemporary American Election Statistics.*

The fact that there is a volume at all is more important than what is in the present one, though what is in the present volume is impressive. American politics being state politics, the data are arranged by states. Included are the county-by-county votes for the most recent general elections for president, governor, and the two sitting United States senators, along with the totals for postwar elections of governor and United States representative. The plurality, and the percentage of total vote and of major party vote, have been computed in each instance, and maps are presented showing the political boundaries within each state and within cities of over 500,000 population. Returns by wards or assembly districts are reported for the cities. Additional profile materials about each state are provided, as well as detailed explanatory notes and the 1950 population for each electoral unit. The volume is a superb technical achievement in its contents and format, and those responsible have rendered a major service to all students of public affairs both in and out of the academic world.

It is announced that future volumes will be modified and expanded in response to the expressed needs of those who hope to use them. As soon as possible the returns of direct primaries should be added and returns for Congressional elections should be given by county. Less obvious decisions must be made with respect to lesser state and local government offices, referenda, contests for party office when filled by popular ballot, and limited types of social and economic data useful in electoral analysis. There will be abundant opportunities to improve the usefulness of later editions and it seems assured that Mr. Scammon and his associates will let none that are feasible go by default.

The appearance of *America Votes* has special significance for the members of the American Political Science Association. Their organization, through a special committee and as a result of much labor by its Washington staff and other members, has succeeded in filling a crying professional need where previous public and private efforts had proved insufficient. The Association has again demonstrated its capacity to organize the energies of scholars for appropriate action. And through the Governmental Affairs Institute, which has been given the task of compiling and editing, the Association has again demonstrated its capacity to bring to successful fruition a complicated, nationwide enterprise which no other organization seemed willing or able to undertake.

America Votes is financed by a grant from the Edgar Stern Family Fund. This is another in the long line of influential contributions made by that foundation to the development of the political science profession. If the promise of Volume I is fulfilled in later editions, the appearance this year of *America Votes* will be viewed half a century hence as one of the memorable milestones in the study of American government.

ALEXANDER HEARD.

University of North Carolina.

American State Politics: An Introduction. BY V. O. KEY, JR. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1956. Pp. vii, 289, ix. $4.50.)

This book, save for comparative reference, explores politics within the states other than those so masterfully examined in the author's *Southern Politics* (1949). Much focus is upon institutions and procedures, with Chapter II illuminating the considerable autonomy of individual state politics and Chapter III showing how partisan government is frustrated by the ubiquitous separation of powers, reinforced by the gerrymander (silent or otherwise). The next four chapters tentatively explain the origins and effects of primary elections. Efforts to popularize control of gubernatorial nominations in one-party states, especially in the South, prompted early adoption of primary laws, which were also manifestations nearly everywhere of popular revulsion against bossism and corruption. More recently, as a compelling analysis shows, states wherein major parties are fairly evenly balanced have witnessed the further development of pre-primary conventions or similar nominating conferences (Chapter IV). That primaries typically activate only small percentages of the eligible voters is indicated in Chapter V, which suggests how this fact, plus the appeals of symbolic names or of glittering personalities, can nominate "the most improbable sorts of characters." Further vindicating its subtitle, "The Illusion of Popular Rule," this chapter shows how power tends to gravitate disproportionately to those intra-state areas wherein one or the other party enjoys great preponderance.

Legislative nominations over recent decades are then examined in a number of states; some consequences of the fact that traditionally major party nominations are often tantamount to election are brought out and, more tentatively than the title of Chapter VI implies, the tendency toward atrophy of the organizations of distinctly minority parties is suggested. Chapter VII turns from the primaries to the "Lottery of the Long Ballot."

Chapter VIII shifts from institutions to the group bases of partisan organizations—historical allegiances, sectional rivalries, metropolitan-nonmetropolitan cleavages, and ethnic-racial-religious differences. In an analysis which is of considerable significance for the current theory of political groups, Key argues that "as partisan groupings develop they come to have an existence quite independent of the affiliations of their members with other social groups" (p. 241). This leads, first, to the question whether the hard core of partisan support is similarly composed on the state and national level and, ultimately, to a thoughtful inquiry into the characteristics of partisan leadership, especially as these characteristics differ between the parties, by geographical sections, and over time.

Chapter IX finds that intra-state politics has failed to keep pace with social demands, has thrown up obstacles to effective popular government, has experienced serious organizational deterioration, and has prompted the transfer of major political demands to Washington. Shortcomings of partisan politics are discerned especially in the quality of candidates developed for state-wide offices and in the failure to maintain adequate opposition parties. While the author is impressed by the power of "blind processes" in shaping political forms and habits (although pages 218 and 280 should be read together on this point), he suggests that state legislatures are perhaps the most strategic points for political reform.

This book is a happy wedding of methodology and purpose. A properly simple statistical apparatus guided by a bold and prolific imagination showers forth analyses which will compel both admiration and (one hopes) emulation. And the whole enterprise is illuminated by the pertinency and urgency of its central political questions, which emerge from the author's common-sense concern for the public welfare.

CHARLES M. HARDIN.

The University of Chicago.

Revolt of the Moderates. BY SAMUEL LUBELL. (New York: Harper & Brothers. 1956. Pp. ix, 296. $2.75.)

This intensely written book seeks to describe and explain the mood of the American public as it both faces and turns away from the political problems of the 1950's. Such an ambitious project is bound to be contentious in its methods and findings. But one gets the general impression of a large task quite well performed—better, in considerable measure, than the author's *Future of American Politics* of four years ago.

Lubell's main thesis appears to be that the mood of the public is one of moderation: don't try too many things and don't try them very hard. He seems to fear that this mood is accompanied by an escapism which denies that there are any real problems to be solved or that, if there are problems, they need be met with more than slogans, sanctimonious righteousness, and a benign indifference. He seems to fear that in the busy process of getting and spending we will indeed lay waste our powers. Yet he shows faith both in the political means for solving problems that are available under our constitutional system and in the ultimate ability of the public itself to face them constitutionally.

The difficulty lies in assessing his data as they bear on this thesis. Lubell is now almost unique among investigators of public opinion in relying on his own rather than group resources for research. He reports that he talked with some 3,500 families during the 1952 campaign. Assuming that he interviewed during a ten-hour day, seven days a week for twenty-six weeks, he was able to spend an average of roughly a half-hour per family. This is fast work.

A more serious methodological problem lies in his prime reliance on deliberately non-random interviewing, because he believes in "concentrating one's interviewing in definable voting areas." Among his definable areas are some noteworthy for ethnic or economic uniqueness and some that are supposedly typical microcosms of regions, for example in Southern locales of race or class tension. This sampling method has the advantages that come with the immediacy of personal contact with vivid individuals. It has the disadvantage of making the selection process depend on the investigator's notions of where vivid, characteristic individuals are to be found. This in turn depends on the general hypotheses or hunches with which the investigator commences his research. He will not go to farm communities, towns, or city precincts where he does not expect to find people who will tell him whether his hypotheses are right or wrong.

The saving grace of this book is that Lubell has checked his own observations against election data—precinct by precinct and county by county—and against the work of others like the Berelson group at Columbia and the Campbell group at Michigan. Although he shows occasional error, the mistakes are small, and he does not do violence to major findings of other research. Some of his statements are banal, as when he reports that extremists in Congress come from the safe districts of both parties or that gerrymandering distorts legislative representation in favor of the party that did the redistricting. Others of his statements have a freshness that keeps one reading, as when he says that McCarthyism was a combined consequence of ethnic segregation among Germans (and Irish) and of frustration over the Korean war.

The difficulty lies in the fact that he is incapable of quantifying his findings in a way that tells *how* intense among *how* many different people is the mood of moderation—and therefore whether it is characteristic of our time or of the moment. He cannot say whether a hypothetical John Biederbecker in Wisconsin voted for McCarthy primarily because McCarthy was in 1952 a teammate of Eisenhower or because John Biederbecker voted as his father Johann told him or because John had a son in Korea. In consequence we have no way of assessing the validity of Lubell's basic thesis.

But this difficulty is not confined to Lubell. Where he is bold and for lack of evidence fails to appraise reliably the political animal, many researchers who are more precise in their techniques timidly probe ears, eyes, and toenails, ignoring the fact that they are in contact with a whole animal. They don't even have hypotheses worth testing. Research in political behavior has now progressed from infancy to adolescence. In studying the vast area of voting returns, Lubell has made some contribution. He has been thinking anew and researching anew in a more than elementary effort to probe areas which some sanctimonious and self-righteous political scientists hesitate to examine for fear they lack the instruments and the definitive edition of a political *Gray's Anatomy*. They do lack instruments and definitive anatomical knowledge. But the body politic is still there and in need of more than topical examination. Lubell has shown at least that scientific progress can be made before the science of public opinion is safely mature.

JAMES C. DAVIES.

California Institute of Technology.

The Conservative Party of Canada, 1920–1949. By John R. Williams. (Durham: Duke University Press. 1956. Pp. x, 242. $6.00.)

Trail-blazing through the relatively uncharted terrain of the Canadian party system is in some danger of becoming a monopoly of American political scientists. The latest example of this trend is the first systematic analysis of either of Canada's two major political parties. The Conservatives, long since deposed from their pre-eminence after Confederation and in office only seven of the past thirty-five years, still constitute the vital core of opposition to the Liberal ascendancy at Ottawa. In probing for the causes of this protracted debility, John R. Williams has consolidated earlier findings and assembled a considerable quantity of new data on the second-ranking contender in Canada's federal politics. To students of Commonwealth affairs this will be a welcome addition to a meager body of literature.

The concentration upon structure, organization, and functions characteristic of the Mackenzie or earlier Duverger type of party study prevails again here. Utilizing the limited written sources available, interviews, and personal observation, Williams has constructed a fairly conventional but well-documented and objective account of the inner workings of this party. Since Canadians have grafted North American features onto British political institutions, there is valuable material here for those concerned with comparative politics. Deserving of particular mention are a critical appraisal of the national convention (consciously borrowed from the United States and overworked in the frenetic quest for a victorious leader), a detailed and realistic description of the national organization, and original findings on the parliamentary group and caucus. The chapters dealing with party leadership and finances and the pattern of federal elections, while perhaps not of the same interest or caliber, bring together information and statistics which have been either widely dispersed or unavailable.

There are, nevertheless, two respects in which the author has so narrowed his scope as to detract from the potential value of his study. For one thing, he has not satisfactorily situated the Conservative party in the larger context of the party system. Certain contrasts and similarities with the Liberal party are delineated, but the Commonwealth Cooperative Federation and Social Credit, whose emergence has had far-reaching effects upon the Conservative position in Western Canada, receive scant mention. Social Credit, in particular, having jettisoned its radical monetary doctrines and become the champion of orthodoxy in many spheres, has all but displaced the Conservatives in Alberta and threatens to repeat the process in British Columbia. A concluding chapter on party policies which forgoes reference to positions adopted by Conservatism's rivals is also at best artificially abstract.

It is, however, the author's attribution of the long eclipse of the Conservative party to essentially mechanical or subsidiary causes which should arouse most scepticism. Williams seems to regard the following as the principal reasons for the long spell of Conservative adversity: (a) the quality of leadership since 1920 (notably that of R. B. Bennett, a domineering prime minister who divided his followers by veering off on a "New Deal" tangent on the eve of the 1935 election); (b) the convention system, which has bred disharmony and encouraged the selection of men unsuited to lead the parliamentary group in opposition; (c) the neglect of party organization, especially at the local level where "federal elections are won and lost in Canada"; (d) the absence of articulate and accepted Conservative principles. These and other frailties he cites have constituted unquestionable handicaps; the Conservative top brass also appears to consider them the most basic shortcomings. Yet by themselves they hardly account for the post-1935 stabilization of the Conservative share of the popular vote at 27–31 per cent. The proposition that in the same period the electoral fortunes of the Liberals and the two minor parties fluctuated with changes in economic conditions has validity but comes no closer to the root causes of the Conservative impasse.

To this reviewer a whole dimension of politics—namely, the conception of political parties as reflections of the societies which they serve—is largely missing from this analysis. An introductory chapter shows that Williams is by no means oblivious to such social realities or the historical events which gave birth to them. Thus he maintains that by the conscription election of 1917 "the Conservatives completely identified themselves as the party of English-speaking, Protestant Canadians loyal to the British Empire," who were simultaneously "feared by many farmers and workers as the party of big business." Yet the less obvious paths by which the Conservatives (in the electorate as well as in Parliament, it might be added) became "a more homogeneous group in matters of religion and language than are the Liberals" and a party dominated by its Ontario contingent, symbolic to much of the rest of the country of the commercial-financial hegemony of "Tory Toronto," are barely explored. There is both recognition and partial explanation of the massive rejection of the Conservative party by French Canadians, without sufficient emphasis to indicate that this has been the single most influential factor in determining this century's federal elections. In a similar vein, only passing attention is paid to the disruptive impact of rapid industrialization on many regions, to the transformation of agriculture, or to the European immigrants who, since 1900, have gradually diluted the heavily British character of the English-speaking group and have tended to shun Conservative candidates at the polls.

Since questions of structure, leadership, and finances are germane to the study of political parties, Williams has added materially to our knowledge of these aspects of one of Canada's major political forces. His interpretation of that party's low standing rests, however, upon secondary or contributory causes which have been far less decisive than the self-induced vice of political inbreeding in a society grown steadily more diversified.

WALTER O. FILLEY.

Wesleyan University.

The Changing World of Soviet Russia: An Analysis of Soviet Internal and External Policies. BY DAVID J. DALLIN. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1956. Pp. ix, 422. $5.00.)

Labour Policy in the USSR, 1917–1928. BY MARGARET DEWAR. (London and New York: Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1956. Pp. viii, 285. $6.00.)

American opinion about the Soviet Union has shifted greatly since the battles of Stalingrad and Berlin. At that time, ten-odd years ago, one was almost considered to be sabotaging the war effort if one criticized the government of Stalin, whereas today it requires a little effort to balance criticism with an appraisal of Soviet achievements, or even to confine oneself to cold, factual description. One of the men responsible for this shift is David J. Dallin, whose war-time (1944) book, *The Real Soviet Russia,* was one of the first attempts, highly controversial at the time, to bring out some of the most unpleasant features of Soviet society as they had developed in the two decades since the revolution. The book saw two editions and has now been published with such thorough-going revisions that it has been given a new title.

Loosely structured, and having no central focus save the aim of debunking our war-time illusions about Soviet society, this is a group of essays around three themes: the new class structure which has emerged from the revolution, the political system through which the new society is being managed, and the main principles, methods, and problems of Soviet foreign relations. The choice of topics seems somewhat haphazard: for instance, while the author treats the position of the churches and the emergence of Titoism, he does not discuss topics of equal or greater importance, such as the minority problem or the rôle of the educational system in the growth of the class structure. Some chapters are well prepared and made contributions to scholarship at the time the book was first published: for instance, the one on forced labor. Even today Mr. Dallin's insistence on viewing the inmates of labor camps as a social class in themselves deserves more serious consideration than it has received in the past. Other chapters, however, are brief and skimpy. Throughout the book the author is careful to present the Soviet system as a fluid, developing organism. This enables him to contrast present policies and institutions with those of earlier days and with the bright hopes by which the Bolsheviks justified their seizure of power.

Thoroughly familiar with his material, the author assumes his reader to have both a great deal of knowledge and plenty of misconception, so that often his tone is that of argument rather than exposition. Instead of taking the long-forgotten intellectual products of war-time good-will to task, he might have performed a more useful service by a less polemical and more systematic and descriptive presentation. While his book is lively and full of interesting observations, it remains impressionistic, journalistic, superficial. And while it does contribute a feel of the conservative, authoritarian climate of present-day Soviet Russia, as contrasted to the heroic dreams of the revolution, it offers little more that is new, exciting, or food for thought. It contains few statements that the reviewer would challenge, but equally few of interest to him. Its journalistic and polemical character tends to render it useless as an introduction for freshmen and general readers, and the scholar in the field should be familiar with the facts it presents.

Mrs. Dewar's monograph on Bolshevik policy regarding the working class during the first eleven years of Soviet rule is far more modest, pedestrian, and useful. In the first 160 pages, the author with great care summarizes the legislation and the heated discussions on labor's role in the "proletarian dictatorship" and the management of industry, workers' rights and material benefits, and the incentives and coercive measures designed to make them submit. These are followed by an appendix of about 120 pages, in which more than five hundred decrees, ordinances, and instructions concerning labor are summarized. The book is an indispensable reference work for students of Soviet political and social developments.

ALFRED G. MEYER.

Columbia University.

The Politics of Compromise: A Study of Parties and Cabinet Government in Sweden. BY DANKWART A. RUSTOW. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1955. Pp. xi, 257. $5.00.)

The author of this book, Professor Rustow of Princeton University, is one of the small group of American scholars who were enabled to spend a year of study in Sweden under the auspices of the Social Science Research Council. It has been the privilege of the reviewer to read in manuscript several similar studies made during the past twenty years, but this is the only one which has appeared in print. Inasmuch as American political scientists have now for a generation shown a great interest in the Swedish political system, it is extremely fortunate that a book has appeared in English. Rustow's work should do something to fill a void caused by the excessive addiction of publishers to the political history of Central Europe.

Three chapters of this study provide the historical background, briefly recounting the events leading to the establishment of the bicameral *Rikstag* of 1866, which replaced the old *Riksdag* of four estates. More attention is given to the rise of *Lantmannapartiet*, translated as the "Ruralist party" (perhaps, Estate-Owners party would be better), and the various protectionist and preliberal coalitions which finally led to the modern *Högerpartiet* (Conservatives) and *Folkpartiet* (Liberals). Although most of the standard sources are cited, the main reliance seems to be on Thermaenius, who until recently was the chief authority on Swedish parties. Chapter Two leads up to the establishment of the Four Party System, and Chapter Three relates the history of the development of this system from 1920 up to the present time. There are still some students who believe that with respect to number there are only three types of party systems: (1) the one-party system, (2) the two-party system, and (3) the multiparty system. However, the Scandinavian political scientists, writing of their own countries' experiences, and the French writers of the New School, looking at various other countries, have all urged that we give serious thought to the merits of the "Few-Party System," that is, something intermediate between the kind of party structure that has plagued France and the one that we have in the United States, the defects of which are now being recognized.

Rustow's chapters on party stability and the effective working of the system of proportional representation employed in Sweden are very good. He notes that there is a lively and highly informed debate being carried on continuously by students of political behavior and electoral methods. But he concludes that the Swedish system is one well-suited to a nation with a high degree of political sophistication.

The final section, dealing with the legislative process, cabinet government, and "the politics of compromise," reveals the wisdom of the Swedes in developing a system of government in which emphasis is placed on the soundness of the procedures for discovering issues, preparing them for legislative action, conducting debate, and communicating decisions to the administration. Rustow's final chapter (which has the same title as the book) seems inconclusive. Undoubtedly the reason for this feeling on the part of the reader is due to the fact that the rather intricate machinery the Swedes have evolved for policy-determination works very well for them because of scores of factors which are unique. One cannot, for example, isolate from Swedish experience one single institution, such as bicameralism, preparation of legislation, or the proportional method of voting, and from this one example recommend the adoption by others of the institution which works so well in the far North. Anyone at all familiar with Swedish social, economic, and political life knows that there are problems unsolved, and some tendencies which are disquieting. But, on the whole, it is refreshing to read a book about a country which has managed its affairs with prudence and care at a time when there are so many studies of threatening circumstances, conflict, and frustration.

Roy V. Peel.

University of Utah.

Labor Relations in British Nationalized Industry. By Sterling D. Spero. (New York: New York University Press. 1955. Pp. 83. $2.75.)

Beyond Nationalization: The Labor Problems of British Coal. By George D. Baldwin. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1955. Pp. xxii, 324. $6.00.)

Here are two first-rate books dealing with that most vexing and important problem, the position of labor in nationalized industry. The books are conceived along quite different lines, and the impact of each is unique both in range and character; yet each in its own way makes a genuine contribution to the total discussion. Interestingly enough, the smaller of the two books undertakes to deal with much the larger and more general aspects of the subject. Spero is concerned broadly and philosophically with the whole array of labor relations under nationalization; Baldwin digs deeply into the coal industry.

Spero presents scarcely more than a carefully thought out and well organized set of notes, setting forth some facts, asking some pertinent questions, and making some judicious comments on the position of labor in British nationalized industry since 1945. In 76 pages of text (small pages, large print) he deals with the general problems of labor representation on the Boards, collective bargaining, strikes and government intervention, consultation, training and promotion, and workers' control, and traces in broad terms the pertinent developments and issues in the coal and railway industries.

This is a wise little book. The author does not go far beneath the surface in his analyses, and his judgments are moderate and qualified; but both analyses and judgments make sense. Labor and nationalization have had a rough time with each other in Britain, but Spero distinguishes among difficulties attributable to nationalization *per se*, to the inherent complexities of the labor-management relationship, to adverse economic conditions from which Britain and British labor have suffered, and to the fact of transition. He points out that "nationalization came to Britain at a time when circumstances were the most favorable for the transition from private to public operation but the least auspicious for demonstrating the success of new economic experiments." It is quite true that nationalization provides a new environment in which "new attitudes can flourish" in dealing with the extremely difficult problems of labor relations. To me it is significant that, in the first decade at least, it does not appear that British nationalization has prevented the Government (even a Labour Government) from behaving like a government in treating with labor, or the men and unions from behaving like men and unions.

Baldwin's book begins where Spero's leaves off; it explores in depth and detail the problems of labor relations in a single nationalized industry. The clue to Baldwin's approach is to be found in the title he has given to the book: the coal crisis in Great Britain is not the result of nationalization, nor will it be cured by nationalization—the difficulties and any solutions lie beyond nationalization. In successive chapters the author analyzes the processes and problems involved in the technological basis of British mining, the Coal Board and the union, collective bargaining, joint consultation at the pits, wages and wage movements, labor supply and absenteeism, the transfer of manpower, and labor and technological change. The study is replete with meaningful facts and statistics, carefully interpreted; and at every turn it gives evidence of Baldwin's thorough knowledge of the technology and organization of the industry, of the miners and their bosses, and of the British economy and the British people. It also demonstrates that Baldwin knows how to lay out and prosecute a difficult and important piece of research. Its structure and air carry conviction. Even before the ink was dry on the several British nationalization acts, American (and British) readers were regaled with conclusions and judgments on the results of nationalization drawn from operating experience, and the flood has continued. Baldwin's book tells us a very great deal that we ought to know about the British coal industry, nationalization, and labor; it also shows us what a book which purports to be based on experience and the record ought to be like.

BEN W. LEWIS.

Oberlin College.

New States and International Organizations. BY BENJAMIN AKZIN. (Paris: UNESCO, International Political Science Association. 1955. Distributed in the U. S. by International Documentation Service, New York 27. Pp. 200.)

This pithy and pregnant monograph is significant both for its content and for its place in the stream of international official and professional cooperation in the promotion of political science. As early as its Second Session in 1947, the General Conference of UNESCO authorized the Director-General to encourage and assist social scientists to study problems arising from recent developments in international collaboration. As one step in this process Walter R. Sharp, then in the UNESCO secretariat, encouraged the International Institute of Administrative Sciences to collect data from fourteen countries, which he summarized as general *rapporteur* in *National Administration and International Organization*, published by IIAS for UNESCO in 1951.

At later sessions, the UNESCO General Conference asked social scientists to focus more sharply on the "administrative, legal and sociological problems of internal organization", facing "Member States that have recently obtained their independence," resulting from their participation in the UN and its specialized agencies. As a result of a meeting of experts convened by UNESCO, in which Rowland Egger took part from the U.S., IIAS was commissioned to undertake a further study, *National Administrations and International Organizations*, for which Roger Grégoire served as general reporter. The focus of the "sociological" problems was deemed, wisely, to lie in the province of political science and international relations. The International Political Science Association accordingly invited *rapporteurs* from six countries to respond to an elaborate questionnaire: India, Indonesia, Israel, Lebanon, Pakistan, and The Philippines, for which John W. Lederle prepared the report. Dr. Akzin supplemented these replies by interviews at the headquarters of UN agencies and by his own rich background of research and teaching on the continent of Europe and in the United States, before he became Herbert Samuel Professor of Political Science and Constitutional Law at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Dr. Akzin's volume is as much a research-planning monograph as a substantive report. It uses the detailed reports from six countries as a springboard for a "first attempt to analyze the political science aspects of the relationships between international organizations and new States generally," intended "to help and encourage" these states to conduct their own studies.

The result is a series of twenty-three pithy chapters, traversing briefly a wide range of problems for study. Each chapter poses provocative questions, based as much on the author's shrewd and realistic insights as on the replies to the questionnaire by the country reporters. What is meant by a "new" state? What is meant by "independence"? How does the crop of new states in the wake of World War II differ significantly from those of 1918—or 1877? How do the international organizations, both within and without the UN system, differ in their receptivity to new states as members? What do new states want or expect from membership in international organizations? What part do citizens of new states play in the non-governmental organizations that are enmeshed with the UN system? How is one to distinguish personal from official roles?

How do new states meet the burden of international cooperation—not only of financial contributions, but of providing competent delegates, experts, and cognizant staffs of ministries? (Akzin estimates that "adequate staffing for international relations" for even the smallest state involves a minimum of "a thousand professionally trained officials.") Which international organizations do new states join and why? Do new states do better or worse than old states in implementing the decisions and recommendations of UN agencies? Is there genuine popular support in new states for participation in international agencies?

On each of these and other questions Akzin offers comments which make clear that "newness" is not of itself always a decisive characteristic: the state of economic development may be more important. He justifies amply his thesis that each state, new or old, needs separate study; and he provides a useful frame of reference for such studies.

Charles S. Ascher.

Brooklyn College.

Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691–1780. By Robert E. Brown. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1955. Pp. ix, 458. $6.00.)

This is an important book. Its thesis is dual: that there was already democracy in Massachusetts at the time of the Revolution, and that therefore, contrary to some recent interpretations, the Revolution did not involve an internal class struggle but was a more or less simple overthrow of British imperial rule. Professor Brown challenges the long accepted view that property qualifications for voting excluded a major proportion of the population from the franchise. He asserts that in Massachusetts, at least, almost all adult males could and did meet these qualifications easily, and he offers convincing evidence to support his argument.

The qualification required of voters was the possession of a forty-shilling freehold, or alternatively, real or personal property valued at forty or fifty pounds. By a study of tax and probate records, the author demonstrates what, in practice, this qualification amounted to. A very small farm or an estate consisting only of "household goods and blacksmith tools" would meet it easily. What percentage of the population owned sufficient property? By comparing records of specific elections in various towns with poll and tax lists of those towns, Professor Brown arrives at an estimate of the proportion of actual voters to adult males. By such calculations, supplemented by other evidence which space does not permit the reviewer to describe, the author concludes that very few adult males were disfranchised, and that, in the rueful words of Governor Hutchinson, "anything with the appearance of a man" was permitted to vote.

The implications of this work are far-reaching. The first question to be asked is whether the situation in Massachusetts was typical of that elsewhere. If it was, then it would appear that there was a much broader base of popular government at the time of the Revolution than we have hitherto assumed. Both the political struggles and the institutions of the Revolutionary period must appear in somewhat different perspective. An extensive suffrage is not necessarily identical with democracy, but it does suggest that "the people" was a very inclusive term in practice and not simply a rhetorical flourish. Professor Brown's work also raises questions about constitutional developments in the first half of the nineteenth century. If the property qualifications of the first state constitutions did not prevent an appreciable number of adult males from voting, then the subsequent removal of those qualifications may represent not so much a new democratic spirit, as constitutional adaptation to a changing economic situation in which an increasing proportion of the population was without property. This would help to explain how the Rhode Island that would have nothing to do with the Convention of 1787 produced a Dorr's Rebellion in 1841–1842. In short, this careful study of the franchise in Massachusetts points up the necessity for much new research and new interpretation before we can trace fully the evolution of democracy in America.

CECELIA M. KENYON.

Smith College.

Charles Beard and the Constitution: A Critical Analysis of "An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution." BY ROBERT E. BROWN. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1956. Pp. 219. $3.50.)

Professor Brown is so shrewish in his critique of the historical method of Charles Beard that we have a right to expect that his own method, like Caesar's wife, will be above reproach. This is not the case.

Beard in his *Interpretation,* Professor Brown thinks, was guilty of omitting, suppressing, misrepresenting, and otherwise distorting evidence. The author begins with a denunciation of Beard's "use of the writings of James Madison," charging that Beard falsified Madison's viewpoint: first, by quoting from the tenth number of *The Federalist* rather than from the others; second, by omitting Madison's reference to non-economic factors. Beard was straining, Professor Brown insists, "to make Madison an 'economic determinist.' " The criticism, typical of this book, is simply captious. Beard did not expound a monolithic theory or pretend that Madison did. He argued, using Madison's words, that "the *most common* and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property." This proposition was a staple both of Federalist and of Anti-Federalist political thought. It is as illuminating and pertinent today as the latest figures on lobbying which show that business, farm, and labor groups far outspend all others.

Every time Professor Brown catches Beard citing another scholar's book, he delivers a homily on the virtues of primary evidence. Yet, as often as not, when Beard produces first-hand observers, Professor Brown rules them out as witnesses for Beard on the ground that they—Hamilton, Henry, Higginson, Knox, Marshall, G. Morris, and others—are not "objective" or "representative." Thus Patrick Henry's report that most small farmers opposed the Constitution "was merely . . . an opinion." In this fashion Professor Brown scorns, disparages, or ignores evidence favorable to Beard. Curiously, he is willing to use some of Beard's witnesses—Hamilton, Knox, and Morris, for example—to uphold his own arguments. He disdains as a "secondary work" McMaster and Stone's book of documents but cites similar volumes himself. He scolds Beard, properly I think, for using 1790 statistics to deal with events two or three years earlier, but supports one of his own contentions with something Madison wrote in 1821. He quotes against Beard one of Charles Pinckney's Convention speeches, then observes: "Pinckney's letter to Madison, quoted by Beard, gives just the opposite view . . . so it apparently depends on which Pinckney quotation we use." Does it? Are a public statement and a private letter equally credible?

While he discounts testimony by Gouverneur Morris favoring Beard, Professor Brown relies heavily upon Morris's assertion that nine-tenths of Americans were landowners. This assertion may be, for all we know, as meaningful as N.A.M. effusions nowadays that "every American is a capitalist." Yet Professor Brown builds upon it a crucial part of his argument, reasoning that "at least ninety per cent of the men were voters. . . . A farmer could not have made a living on a freehold small enough to disfranchise him." In condemnations of democracy by Convention members Professor Brown sees further proof that in 1787, contrary to Beard, the United States was a democracy.

He belittles statements like that of Mercer of Maryland, which labels "the Governments of America" "aristocracies," and that of Hamilton, which notes in "all" states "some individuals . . . deprived of the right [to vote] altogether, not having the requisite qualification of property." Apparently he is not aware that democracy means not only the right to vote but *equality* in that right. Where representation is weighted to favor wealthier citizens—as it was in twelve of the thirteen states—there prevails a species of aristocracy.

No doubt Beard exaggerated the role of personalty interests in the establishment of the Constitution. Beard acknowledged this in his later years. But Professor Brown, as usual, is overzealous in his criticism. "Readers of *An Economic Interpretation*," he states, "should be aware that the use of the phrase 'debtor farmers' throughout the work is not based on any evidence whatsoever." Shays' rebellion? Too small and local, the author says, then tells us later the Shaysites were numerous enough to win control over the government of Massachusetts. He overlooks this statement by Madison, whose credibility he does not challenge: "Landed possessions were no certain evidence of real wealth. Many enjoyed them to a great extent who were more in debt than they were worth. The unjust laws of the States had proceeded more from this class of men, than any others. It had often happened that men who had acquired landed property on credit, got into the Legislatures with a view of promoting an unjust protection agst. their Creditors."

Moreover, that personalty groups were numerically small did not make them politically insignificant—power is not a matter of numbers alone. Such groups were important enough that, as Professor Brown admits, Gouverneur Morris proposed creating a senate "based on personalty." In the newspapers of the 1780's—in Elliot's *Debates* too—is overwhelming evidence of conflict involving personalty interests, conflict in which "moneyed men," "speculators and blood suckers," were hotly denounced.

Professor Brown's chief contribution, perhaps, is his detailed critique of Beard's account of the framers' personal stake in their deliberations. But he does not grant that Beard, though wrong on specifics, correctly identified the social position of the framers. What is more, Beard's book, for all its shortcomings, is informed by a theory of politics still generally valid: that economic interests ordinarily dominate the political process. Beard made clear that the Constitution was an object of struggle between groups primarily economic in character. This view was confirmed by one of Professor Brown's favorite witnesses, John Quincy Adams, who noted that the Constitution was being received enthusiastically by rich and conservative elements. "Nor do I wonder at all . . . as it is calculated to increase the influence, power and wealth of those who have any influence. If the Constitution be adopted it will be a grand point in favor of the aristocratic party."

MAURICE KLAIN.

Western Reserve University.

The Civilian and the Military. BY ARTHUR A. EKIRCH, JR. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1956. Pp. xi, 340. $6.50.)

This is a well-written history of the anti-military tradition in the United States. It is a useful corrective to current tendencies in American political and historical scholarship: for instance, it is well to be reminded that military fervor played an important part in Andrew Jackson's popular support and that, however commendable and timely was Theodore Roosevelt's interest in world affairs, one of its motive forces was a romantic passion for things martial. Professor Ekirch has chronicled American attitudes about military institutions from pre-Revolutionary times—with an "Anglo-American heritage" of anti-militarism—to the Eisenhower Administration. With few exceptions, whatever he has included in his chronicle he has presented dispassionately. And he has done enough digging to make his work valuable for general scholarly reference. His book is a significant addition to the growing literature on American military affairs. But its value can be properly appreciated only if its limitations are properly understood. The broad chronology is not definitive; rather, the author's meaning and use of thematic concepts focus and set the limits of the book.

Last year Professor Ekirch published a book entitled *The Decline of American Liberalism;* the present volume might well have been entitled *The Rise of American Militarism,* for it is a supplement to that earlier volume, and its theme is built upon concepts and assumptions which, though never thoroughly defined or analyzed in either book, are clearer in the first. Central to the theme of both books is the author's conception of liberalism. While he sketches its historical derivation in the first two chapters of *The Decline of American*

Liberalism, it is clear in both books that he is not interested in the interaction of the liberal ideal of human freedom with the political context. That is, he measures historical events against the ideal of a peaceful, *laissez-faire*, liberal utopia and ignores the very real dilemmas encountered in the choice of means for achieving the ultimate ideal of human freedom. Both books thus beg the question how to balance domestic liberty with national security.

Clearly, the author has forborne to explain his liberal utopian assumptions to the reader because of his compunctions as a historian. But the effect has been not to exclude those assumptions, but only to neglect their orderly exposition and examination. For the breadth of his subject has made necessary the use of unexpressed criteria in the selection of subject matter. Besides his utopian approach, Professor Ekirch's assumptions are embodied primarily in his two mutually exclusive categories, militarism and anti-militarism (or, sometimes, liberalism). He never defines either term adequately for the use to which he puts it; but he leaves the undeniable impression that the more of the first and the less of the second the better. Anyone who wears a uniform or talks about war seems to be a militarist, and is probably wrong. Anyone who opposes the use or maintenance of armed forces, for whatever reason, is an anti-militarist, and is probably right. At times this devil-angel frame of reference gives an interesting volume some strange twists; constantly, it reminds the reader of what are in fact the author's predispositions; inevitably, it limits the value of the book. Undefined, his terms are applied loosely and superficially. Unmentioned, his assumptions are a major omission.

Because the book fails to deal with the relationship of utopian liberal ideals to the real world, the causes of the change here chronicled remain a mystery. Why the anti-militarist tradition in the United States has declined is one of the crucial questions in this inquiry, yet no attempt is made to answer it. To do so would admittedly be presumptive, and the historian can be excused from trying; but to avoid any reference to the context of foreign policy in which the issues of national military policy have been shaped is to imply a wholly unjustifiable assumption, far more presumptive than would be an answer to the question why anti-militarism declined. The studied exclusion of all but a few meager references to objective strategic considerations can only imply that such considerations are irrelevant in setting the proper role of the military, a claim which, to say the least, is hardly well enough established to serve as a premise for the writing of history.

Moreover, because everything seems to be either "militarist" or "anti-militarist," discussion of the extent of influence of both concepts tends to be oversimplified and, often, superficial. For example, the appointment of Eisenhower as president of Columbia University is cited as an indication of the growth of militarism in American life. Yet later it is recognized that Eisenhower is less militarist than many civilians. In this instance the superficial application of categories leads to explicit inconsistency.

The militarist pigeon-hole is well stuffed. Into it go government centralization, high taxes, and most American presidents, who come off badly under Professor Ekirch's analysis. Indeed, Harding seems to rate the highest place among them all.

The author has done some thoughtful and careful work; it is unfortunate, however, that he has taken a series of classical liberal utopian tenets as major and unquestioned premises from which to begin, rather than examining them, and the meaning of militarism as well, in the light of American experience.

PAUL Y. HAMMOND.

Columbia University.

The New World of Henri Saint-Simon. BY FRANK MANUEL. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. xi, 433. $7.50.)

It is hardly an accident that both Proudhon and Saint-Simon, both relegated to the limbo of utopian dreamers by Marx and Engels, should have become subjects of two full-length monographs in the past year—the first to appear in the English language. Whoever will review George Woodcock's *Proudhon* in these pages may decide that it is the more stimulating of the two works, but he should be willing to grant that Professor Manuel's study is the more exhaustive work. It omits nothing worth knowing about Saint-Simon's great vision of the coming scientific order of society and adds a great deal of disturbing information about Saint-Simon the man. What emerges is the portrait of a figure out of Balzac: a power-maddened dilettante attempting in vain to recoup his lost aristocratic fortune. The *ci-devant* count's real estate speculations during the French revolution were quite lurid from the viewpoint of accepted business morality. But these dubious activities were merely the foil for his truly Napoleonic ambition to become the founder of the new industrial state which would close the chasm of revolutionary anarchy. Professor Manuel is at his best in showing the essentially conservative and syncretistic character of Saint-Simon's ideas. In his "system," "the scientific élite of Condorcet, the findings of the new physiology of Bichat, the new psychology of Cabanis coalesced with an appreciation of the organic order of the theocrats," de Bonald and de Maistre. He absorbed the rationalism of the *philosophes* but "came away with a different reading of the natural: the natural was inequality" (p. 300). On this basis, he constructed his technocratic and theocratic hierarchy and became the ancestor of the modern elitist school as well as of the "managerial" theory of power.

All this is admirably documented in Professor Manuel's account, which also includes the disciples: Auguste Comte turned Judas, while the rest, among them a surprising number of young Jewish intellectuals, acclaimed the great bohemian as their Messiah, with Bazard and Enfantin sharing the role of Paulus. The way Professor Manuel has managed to plumb the intellectual undercurrents of the period deserves to be called an act of total scholarly immersion. By the same act, he deprived himself of the chance to come up for air and have a look at his own work and its place in the history of ideas. It is sure to play a part, a valuable part, in the Utopian renaissance which has been going on for quite a while, but it does not make an attempt to probe the causes of that renaissance.

At least three reasons may be offered to explain this most intriguing comeback of Marx's predecessors and competitors. Like them, we are conscious of a breakdown of the old morality and anxious to discover forces of renewal. Some of us are groping, as did Saint-Simon and his school, for the New Christianity. It is this element of restoration in a revolutionary scheme that should appeal to our New Conservatives. The liberals, in turn, will be attracted by the Saint-Simonian repudiation of class violence. As the attrition of the Marxist dogma proceeds apace and the utopian character of "scientific socialism" becomes transparent, the Old Utopians begin to look better and better. Their message, while presaging revolutionary advances, did preach peaceful change. Those dissatisfied today with the *status quo* may rediscover in Saint-Simon a Marx without the sting. And, finally, as society becomes more manageable, more susceptible to manipulation *from above,* Saint-Simon begins to look less and less like an utopian, much more plausible and *realistic* than he did in his own time. But here the ways part: those who will hail him as the prophet of the managerial, technocratic gospel will hear with dismay that "the application of scientific progress to rational transformation of society ended in a clearly articulated vision of a totalitarian society. . . . The logic and tyranny of progress gave to the world the progress of total tyranny." Thus Albert Salomon on Saint-Simon in *The Tyranny of Progress* (New York, 1955, p. 104). Saint-Simon's biographer was probably wise in resisting the temptation to find so much clarity where it does not exist, for the good reason that Saint-Simon, like so many other seminal thinkers, is many things to many men and should not be subjected to an exercise in logic.

JAMES H. MEISEL.

University of Michigan.

Far Eastern Politics in the Postwar Period. BY HAROLD M. VINACKE. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1956. Pp. vii, 497. $5.00.)

With this authoritative volume Professor Vinacke adds to his stature as a careful, objective scholar. He adds also to the debt which other students and serious lay readers owe him in the expanding field of Far Eastern studies. The scope of his survey is wide, comprehending the countries of southeastern Asia as well as those until recently regarded as composing the Far East: China, Japan, and Korea. A notable feature is the treatment of the inter-relationships of policies and developments in Europe with those in Asia. Although the postwar decade is the period upon which the author's interest is centered, the reader is given a running start by a review, in the early chapters, of prewar and wartime Japan and China and of wartime relationships between the greater powers.

While more emphasis might have been placed upon the remarkable ingenuity of the Japanese administrators in what the author terms the "co-poverty" sphere, their success in stimulating nascent nationalism and their flexibility in shifting from a program of Japanization to one of sponsoring independence, as the fortunes of war changed, is well demonstrated. Professor Vinacke also points out that the Japanese were less acute in their estimate of American military spirit and industrial capacity and of Russian dependability as a neutral. One of the best features of the book is the treatment of the Kuomintang-Communist rivalry for power in China. Excellent also is the account of the rise of Mao Tse-tung and of his success in fitting the warhead of communist theory to the powder-filled shell of Chinese agrarianism.

The author passes from his four introductory chapters to the problems evoked by the war in China, Korea, Indochina, Thailand, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Japan. He gives considerable attention to India's part in the new era and includes the Korean war. His account of the nature and major lines of policy of the Communist government of China, like his treatment of American efforts to bring two totalitarian regimes into democratic union, is adequate and unbiased. However, the view that British and Indian recognition of Communist Peiping was premature and interventionist is not convincingly argued. The same is true of the contention that "the Chinese Communist party was not in fact national but was an instrument of international communism, which, in turn, was an instrument of Soviet Russia's foreign policy." This conclusion seems not to accord with the author's statement that "the decision to intervene in Korea would seem to have been taken by the Chinese on their own initiative rather than under Russian pressure." The account of Kuomintang and Communist China's relations with Viet Minh also exhibits the two Chinese regimes as acting independently, on different bases, but without regard to other than Chinese interests.

With regard to the re-entrance of the colonial powers into territories conquered by the Japanese, the author holds that they were legally entitled to do so and that the American government was legally obligated to recognize that fact. One is led to question, however, the quality of the Allies' intelligence services in regard to the strong nationalist sentiment which prevailed so generally in those areas. Given adequate information, would the powers have reassumed the "white man's burden," incurring thereby the tremendous cost in lives and treasure that followed? Vinacke believes that Western colonialism in the Far East is ended. While repudiating charges of imperialism against American postwar policy, he stresses the difficulties involved in our efforts to reconcile programs of assistance with the containment of Communism. "Neutralism" in Asia is, he believes, a consequence of unreadiness to perceive the menace of Communism and to accept American aid upon conditions believed to be related to American rather than Asiatic interests. Uncertainties regarding our policy toward Formosa have been a major factor in complicating our relations with the new states of East Asia. At the end of the first postwar decade the paramount issue of war or peace remained to cloud the future not only of Western relations with Asia but of intra-Western relations.

Throughout this work Professor Vinacke maintains a uniformly high level of attention to available articles as well as to monographs and secondary materials. Necessarily, in covering so vast a field within five hundred pages, he has had to compress many topics into a few paragraphs. He has, however, combined clarity and conciseness with such success as to provide a readable and understandable analysis of the changes in domestic and international politics which World War II brought about in Eastern Asia. Five maps and fifteen illustrations admirably supplement the text, which is well indexed.

HAROLD S. QUIGLEY.

University of Minnesota.

The Historical Status of Tibet. BY TIEH-TSENG LI. (New York: King's Crown Press. 1956. Pp. xi, 312. $5.00.)

Because of the work of recent explorers present-day Tibet is fairly well known, but we are still ignorant of many phases of Tibetan history. This is partly due to the fact that though there is a large Tibetan literature, works dealing with history are surprisingly few in number and inadequate in scope. For this reason, all persons interested in the problem of Tibetan history will give a warm welcome to Mr. Li's work on *The Historical Status of Tibet.* Mr. Li does not pretend to a master of Tibetan literature or even of the Tibetan language, but he is an eminent authority on Chinese historiography and has made a careful study of the many passages in the Chinese dynastic histories which deal with the relations between China and Tibet and are little known in the West. For recent times Mr. Li makes use of numerous reports prepared by Chinese envoys to the Tibetan government, some of which exist only in manuscript and are not generally available. This greatly enhances the value of the book.

Though the book is to be warmly recommended, it suffers from one noticeable weakness. This is the fact that Mr. Li is a vigorous propagandist. Though the true facts are given, they are marshaled in such a way as to support Mr. Li's main thesis: that Tibet has long been an integral part of the Chinese Empire, and that it is only fair and just that Tibet continue in this status. As a matter of fact, this thesis is open to serious doubt even on the basis of the Chinese records as cited by Mr. Li. As the book itself shows, during the periods when China was ruled over by native Chinese dynasties (such as the T'ang, Sung, and Ming dynasties), embassies passed between China and Tibet, but the Chinese were never able to secure control over the Tibetan secular or ecclesiastical authorities. It was only when China itself was ruled over by foreigners, such as the Mongols and the Manchus, that the Tibetans paid more than lip service to the Emperors of China. In point of fact, both the Mongols and the Manchus secured control over Tibet *before* and not after they secured control over China.

The Tibetans considered themselves to be vassals not of the Chinese but of the Mongol and Manchu overlords of China. When the Manchu dynasty fell (1912), most Tibetans felt that their status as Manchu vassals automatically lapsed. At this time all Chinese residents inside Tibet were expelled. From 1912 to 1950 the Tibetans struggled to assert and maintain their *de facto* independence. Sometimes they accepted aid from the government of British India in order to keep the Chinese out; sometimes they accepted aid from China in order to keep the British from becoming too powerful. But at all times the Tibetans were anxious not to be absorbed into British India and not to be re-absorbed into China. The departure of the British from India greatly weakened the Tibetan position, and in 1950 the Chinese Communists secured control over the country. It is clear, however, even from Mr. Li's book, that this was the result of superior military force and not of the wishes of the Tibetan people. Even in the present year (1956) we hear of violent outbreaks of guerrilla warfare on the part of the Tibetans against the Chinese occupational authorities.

Even if one were to stretch a point and admit that Tibet was for many centuries an integral part of the Chinese Empire, this still does not mean that the Chinese have a rightful claim to Tibet, if one accepts the general principle of the right of self-determination. The Irish will not admit that the English have a right to govern Ireland, even though it is an undoubted fact that for several centuries Ireland was an integral part of the British Kingdom. The same is true of other peoples who first secured their independence in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

A serious objection must be made to one of Mr. Li's other claims. This is the statement (p. 211) that Tibet absorbed civilization mainly from China and only in a lesser degree from India. It is true that racially the Tibetans (being Mongoloids) are more closely related to the Chinese than to the Hindus. It is true that the Tibetan spoken language is related distantly, *very* distantly, to the Chinese spoken language (but so are Burmese and Siamese). It is true that from time to time certain elements of Chinese culture have been borrowed and absorbed by the Tibetans. But anyone who travels in Tibet soon becomes acutely aware that the broad basis of Tibetan culture is primarily Indian in origin. The Tibetans have never made any use of the Chinese ideographs in writing but developed a phonetic script based upon the Indian Devanagari alphabet. A few Chinese books (mostly Buddhist *sutras*) were translated into Tibetan, but the overwhelming mass of Tibetan literature consists of translations from Sanskrit. Such original works as exist are modelled upon these Sanskrit writings. Lamaism, the Tibetan form of Buddhism, is derived from the Tantric type of Buddhism which developed in India during the seventh and eighth centuries A.D., long after China had borrowed an earlier and purer form of Buddhism. The art, the music, and the drama of Tibet are also basically Indian in origin.

In spite of certain defects, however, Mr. Li's book is to be warmly recommended to all those interested in the by-paths of Far Eastern history.

WILLIAM M. MCGOVERN.

Northwestern University.

Judges and Jurors: Their Functions, Qualifications and Selection. BY ARTHUR T. VANDERBILT. (Boston, Mass.: Boston University Press. 1956. Pp. 76. $3.00.)

The Instrumentalities of Justice: Their Forms, Functions and Limitations. BY FRANCIS R. AUMANN. (Columbus: The Ohio State University Press. 1956. Pp. ix, 137. $3.50.)

Arthur T. Vanderbilt, the highly articulate Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey, and Professor Aumann have long been concerned with the administration of justice in the United States. The former's book, *Minimum Standards of Judicial Administration* (1949), and the latter's study of *The Changing American Legal System* (1940) attest to this interest. This interest is further developed in the two books under review. Judge Vanderbilt's book is the shorter of the two, and is confined to an analysis of judges and jurors only. Professor Aumann's volume covers more ground, and indeed touches upon all of the main instrumentalities of justice, including the lawyers and the law. Neither book propounds any particular thesis, and neither breaks new ground. While both suggest the necessity of certain reforms, they follow the lines of thought previously blocked out by such writers in the field as Pound, Willoughby, and Jerome Frank. Both authors make some comparisons with English and continental European practices and institutions.

Judge Vanderbilt's little book consists of three lectures originally given in 1954–5 at Boston University under the Gaspar G. Bacon Lectureship on the Constitution of the United States. While they were written for oral delivery, the author has added the valuable and extensive supporting annotations which one expects to find in his writings. The first lecture deals with the office and functions of the judges, and the second with their attributes and selection. The final lecture is concerned with the functions, qualifications, and selection of jurors. Judge Vanderbilt managed to crowd a great deal of useful information into his three lectures.

Apart from the description of existing practices, Vanderbilt's book focuses attention on two principal ideas. So far as the judges are concerned, the contention is that their central quality, in the light of their functions, must be impartiality, and impartiality is impossible without independence. In order to achieve independence judges must be free from political influences and enjoy security of tenure. He prefers the appointment method for the selection of judges over the popular election method, but in view of American habits he settles for a combination of the two such as is found in California and Missouri. He also argues that the judiciary ought to be bipartisan. So far as the jury system is concerned, Judge Vanderbilt's position is that the key to its improvement lies in giving the judges greater control over its operation. Contending lawyers want favorable juries; in contrast, the impartial judge desires an impartial jury. Since he believes that the greatest evil in jury selection is politics, the solution in his opinion lies in shifting authority to the nonpolitical judge. The judge should also have greater control over the conduct of the trial, as in England, including the right to comment on the evidence to the jury. Vanderbilt's other suggestions for improving the jury system are now quite standard: fewer exemptions from service, use of questionnaires and personal interviews, restriction of the *voir dire*, etc.

Professor Aumann's book covers far more subjects than can be explored adequately within such a small number of pages. Part I, consisting of three very brief chapters, deals with the "ancient problem" of the reconciliation of justice with law and describes the growth of the Roman and English legal systems. The second part describes the machinery of justice, the judiciary, the structure of courts, the problem of personnel, and some aspects of judicial procedure. The third part deals with some public attitudes towards law and lawyers. He defends the law against the charge of being too complicated, and the lawyer against a number of time-honored canards.

One looking for a short, orderly, and eminently reasonable introduction to our legal system will find this book profitable. In a largely descriptive manner it touches upon the main facts of American justice. Something is lost from over-condensation, but on the whole the reader will learn what the law is, who administers it, and what its growing edges are today.

DAVID FELLMAN.

University of Wisconsin.

The Government and Administration of Wyoming: American Commonwealths Series. BY HERMAN H. TRACHSEL AND RALPH M. WADE. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1955. Pp. xiv, 381. $4.95.)

The Government and Administration of New York: American Commonwealths Series. BY LYNTON K. CALDWELL. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1954. Pp. xviii, 506. $5.95.)

The Government and Administration of Mississippi: American Commonwealths Series. BY ROBERT B. HIGHSAW AND CHARLES N. FORTENBERRY. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1954. Pp. xiv, 414. $4.95.)

The Government and Administration of Florida: American Commonwealths Series. BY WILSON K. DOYLE, ANGUS MCKENZIE LAIRD AND S. SHERMAN WEISS. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1954. Pp. xv, 444. $4.95.)

The Government and Administration of North Carolina: American Commonwealths Series. BY ROBERT S. RANKIN. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1955. Pp. xiv, 429. $4.95)

The Government and Administration of Georgia: American Commonwealths Series. BY CULLEN B. GOSNELL AND C. DAVID ANDERSON. (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1956. Pp. xix, 403. $4.95)

The President's Commission on Intergovernmental Relations observed in its report that "the success of our federal system . . . depends in large measure upon the performance of the States." This is certainly true, but it might be argued further that the performance of the states is likely to be significantly improved only when there is an awareness of the inadequacy of most state governments. No such public awareness now exists despite a decade of almost unprecedented attention to state problems. The appointment of the President's Commission is evidence of the renewed interest, as are the many "little Hoover commissions" and the current interest among political scientists in comparative state government. The latest attack on public indifference to state government is the initiation of the American Commonwealths Series, one volume on each of the states, under the editorship of W. Brooke Graves. The first six of the Series have now been published.

The curse of state government literature, and especially of state government textbooks, has been the abominable tendency to "analyze" by saying that x number of states do it this way and y number that, seldom transcending this enumerative kind of superficial analysis. This shortcoming is no doubt largely due to the absence of state by state studies of the actual governmental problems and procedures of the forty-eight states. Whatever the inadequacies of these present volumes, they do begin to provide data from which more meaningful generalizations can be made. Rural over-representation in the legislatures, over-long and statute-laden constitutions, disorganized court systems, administrative irresponsibility, legislative agendas loaded down with local special legislation—all these problems and others are considered within the context of going governmental systems, not as assumed categories drawn from the tables in *The Book of the States.*

With some minor exceptions all six books are organized along similar lines, which facilitates making comparisons between states. Each takes up constitutional, political, legislative, executive, and administrative problems plus a detailed discussion of particular functions. Descriptions of functions and of administration are important elements of such textbooks, but it is regrettable that between one-half and two-thirds of each volume is devoted to these questions alone. This probably would not be such a detriment were the remaining portions more adequate, but unfortunately in all cases the least valuable parts are those discussing political and legislative matters. The North Carolina and New York studies give considerable insight into the politics of those two states. The Georgia and Florida studies are somewhat less revealing, but they do give the reader a reasonable understanding of the political systems. The Mississippi and Wyoming volumes unhappily do very little in this respect. An outsider reading the Mississippi study would certainly never conclude that the status of the Negro had anything in particular to do with Mississippi politics. Virtually the only reference to the Negro in regard to politics refers to their nonvoting and says: "Although now eligible to vote, few Negroes exhibit any interest or take any part in voting. Naturally the number voting may be expected to increase as the Negro increases in knowledge of, and familiarity with, state and local politics" (p. 34). Both the Mississippi and Wyoming studies substitute a summary of electoral laws for an analysis of the political system. This is especially unfortunate, since outsiders have so little opportunity to acquire this information except from on-the-spot students of the caliber of these authors.

It is to be hoped that in future numbers of the series the authors will take advantage of the prime comparative materials their predecessors have made available in these six volumes. And except where state constitutions are almost volume-length in themselves, it would seem worthwhile to include the state constitution in an appendix.

The publishers are to be congratulated on this venture. With the ultimate completion of the Series, state government literature will be the richer by far.

W. DUANE LOCKARD.

Connecticut College.

Elections and Electors: Studies in Democratic Representation. By J. F. S. Ross. (Fair Lawn, N. J.: Essential Books, Inc. 1955. Pp. 480. $6.75.)

This new study by the author of *Parliamentary Representation* (1943) is an impressive addition to the growing list of British works on the electoral system. Both sound scholarship and a prodigious industry have gone into it. But Mr. Ross is also a vigorous advocate with an axe to grind; he believes in proportional representation and his book is designed to convince others. Indeed, he says that those who refuse to be convinced are either ill informed or perverse. This is the language of polemic rather than of scholarship, and the first half of the book is laden with it.

The second half is a series of analyses of unrelated aspects of parliamentary representation. In contrast with the first half, it is calmer and the judgment is more dispassionate. Indeed, these are valuable studies, though they might better have been separately published; they cast much light on such things as the education and vocation of MP's, the nominating system, the Speaker's Conferences, and other matters. But the author's main interest, even so, lies in the first half of the book.

He insists quite properly that proportional representation is not an electoral system but a principle which different electoral systems achieve in varying measure. He surveys a wide variety of systems and settles his choice on one combination of these. He vehemently rejects the single-member district, plurality election scheme: it offers the voters no workable alternatives; it represents them inaccurately; and it corrupts the results. He chooses therefore a multi-member district and combines with it a system of preferential voting and counting by quota, specifically the "Droop quota," a scheme that is regularly though inaccurately called the "single transferable vote." The argument in behalf of this plan is well prepared and its appeal is powerful; clearly such a system is more accurately representative than the present one. But more is claimed for it than can be justified. Mr. Ross takes great pains to disprove in advance the charge that his method will multiply parties and encourage minor groups. He concludes upon examination that his system would have produced very little change in the outcome of the 1950 election and that it certainly would not have encouraged any minor parties. But he achieves this conclusion by calling the Liberals a major national party and insisting that they deserve even more than the doubled representation his system would have given them. This apparently means that there is little difference between a two- and a three-party system. Indeed, he insists that, although the present system "is a handicap to small parties," his plan would "hinder rather than help" them. The analysis ignores the fundamental fact that parties under such a system would behave differently. To the extent that the electoral system assures the proportional representation of small groups, it encourages them to compete. The result would inevitably be the alteration of the existing two-party arrangement.

Whether Mr. Ross would welcome this is hard to say. He castigates the two-party system for its unrepresentativeness (a mandate is "just not possible"), yet he defends his reform on the ground that it would not increase the representation of minor parties. In my view it would do exactly this.

He also expects an attack from those who consider a two-party system essential to stable government, but his discussion of this is brief and almost unconcerned. He admits that his system may require coalition governments (without encouraging minor parties?) but thinks this may not be bad; at least it would be more accurately representative. This is most unsatisfactory. Without suggesting that stability and governmental effectiveness are possible only in a two-party system, one may still insist his reform would have ramifying effects on other parts of the constitution. In particular, what would happen to the traditional role of the opposition if England should come to love coalitions?

Make no mistake; this is a useful book. The collection of data is most impressive and the analyses of various electoral schemes and problems are keen and illuminating. The book suffers badly, however, from inadequate examination of the ancillary effects of its proposals upon the surrounding institutions; and it especially fails to deal with the question of continuing stability and effectiveness in government. Mr. Ross says that "the real issue is whether we are to have representative government." Certainly this is a real issue, but equally real and at least equally important is whether we are to have effective government. Which, after all, is the main function of representative government—to represent or to govern?

WILLIAM S. LIVINGSTON.

The University of Texas.

BOOK NOTES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

The Power Elite. By C. Wright Mills. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1956. Pp. 423. $6.00.)

Charles Wright Mills, who will be remembered for his previous book *White Collar*, has produced in *The Power Elite* a scathing indictment of contemporary American society. Some have compared *The Power Elite* in potential influence to Veblen's *Theory of the Leisure Class*, with some injustice to Veblen, who was a much sounder and more cautious theorist than Mills. The publisher claims the title of "provocative" for the work, and so it is, but chiefly because of the magnitude of the absurdity which emerges as its conclusion. Actually, much of Mills's ponderous three hundred or more pages merely labors points well known to most men. It does not come as a surprise to find that American society is elitist—all societies are—or that some men have more money and power than others, or that the increasing complexity of society has resulted in the separation of the masses from significant decision making. Nor is it a revelation to discover that the tone of contemporary American society is materialistic and that a good bit of cynicism has been introduced into the average man's evaluation of the political, economic, and social environment in which he lives. On these foundations, which the author has documented with considerable detail, he erects some startling generalizations, which constitute the "provocative" aspects of the book. He concludes that we are ruled in America today by three elites, the men of corporate wealth, the militarists, and the politicians. These three elites are victims of the "higher immorality" in that they operate in an irresponsible, immoral, and cynical disregard for all but their own interests. Seemingly they are devoid of culture, in the traditional sense of the term, and, what is worse, are consciously or unconsciously uniting together to rule the rest of us in their own interests. The sordid, vulgarized, and cynical picture of American society which emerges from the author's personal sense of frustration leaves one wondering how the organization functions at all.

This over-exaggeration of what at best are trends and tendencies in American culture places the author's conclusions in the realm of half truths. If his purpose in over-drawing his picture is to excite us to reform, he again disappoints us, for at no stage in his narrative does he offer or propose any way out of our slough of vulgarity and corruption. American society, while elitist, is still far more pluralistic than Mills will admit. There are other "power elites" unmentioned by him, and there are still fundamental traditions of honesty and responsibility in the American people, sufficient to give us at least the hope that all is not as bad as Professor Mills would have us believe. —H. Malcolm MacDonald, *University of Texas.*

Chief Justice John Marshall: A Reappraisal. Ed. W. Melville Jones. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1956. Pp. xvii, 195. $3.00.)

Here is a collection of nine papers delivered at the College of William and Mary in May, 1955, to celebrate the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of the Chief Justice. The book contains in addition an Introduction to the topics of the papers written by Professor Swisher, a Foreword by Chief Justice Warren, and a Preface by the editor.

One emerges from the reading with a fairly rounded impression of what kind of man John Marshall was, where his interests lay, and what contributions he made to the foundation of American Constitutional law. The papers range in character from the heavily footnoted, such as that written by Julius Goebel, Jr., on the common law, to one with no footnotes at all, like Arthur Holcombe's analysis of John Marshall's conservatism.

While the subtitle of the book carries the word "reappraisal," the reader is left just about where he was before. But the word is justified nevertheless. Beveridge's *Life* of the Chief Justice is subjected to surgery; the prevailing notion that Marshall did not cite precedents because he did not know of any is dispelled once for all; his acumen as a practicing lawyer is demonstrated and linked to his judicial technique.

Because of the occasion on which the papers were delivered, the writers obviously feel free to express their own opinions. There is stimulating nourishment in a wealth of provocative comments all through the book. Irving Brant's paper on the lawyers and politicians is a gem of irony and wit. And there is George L. Haskin's comment that Marshall understood the *organic* relationships of commercial transactions and did not intend the mechanical tests which his followers derived from his doctrines. There is Goebel's description of a modern udicial opinion as one "with its text well arded with citations, as if too wanting in juice to be otherwise swallowed, and garnished *sub pede* with columns of bolstering notes." All of the papers maintain a high degree of urbanity and sophistication and show that grace of style is not unbecoming to scholarship.

It should perhaps be noted with regard to the distribution of the subject matter that three papers are given to "Marshall and His Times," two go to judicial review, and four are devoted to Marshall's particular contributions to the law. While the division of emphasis is a happy one, the order in which the chapters fall will not seem inevitable to every reader, and several of the topics can be relocated to fit the reader's mode of association without harming the presentation of the subject. Of course there had to be a sequence, and perhaps the fairest thing to say is that the one used here is justifiable, although it falls short of being self-evident.—P. T. FENN, *Oberlin College.*

The Rise of the Vice Presidency. BY IRVING G. WILLIAMS. (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press. 1956. Pp. vii, 266. $4.50.)

The role of Vice Presidents in Presidential election campaigns, their relations with the Presidents under whom they served, and their manner of discharging their powers and functions as second officers in the national government are the subjects treated in this historical survey. It is an aptly-titled volume, for undoubtedly, since the turn of the century and particularly in the past three decades, the office of Vice President has been enjoying what might be termed a renaissance. It is no longer the obscure, forgotten office it became soon after the adoption of the Twelfth Amendment, assigned to a party hack as a mere makeweight on the national ticket.

The increasing importance of the office in the eyes of political leaders as well as the general public is underlined by the fact that, whereas none of the four nineteenth-century Vice Presidents who succeeded to the Presidency was able to win election to the Presidency in his own right, all three of the twentieth-century succeeding Vice Presidents did so. The study also fully develops the point that today the Vice President, by usage and by statute, has duties and responsibilities that extend far beyond his single constitutional function as presiding officer in the Senate. Serious protracted illnesses of two Presidents since World War I have also served to focus attention on the problem of the Vice President's role during periods of Presidential inability.

Based upon extensive research and written in an interesting style, this is a timely volume on a subject that will command increasing attention in the future.—JOSEPH E. KALLENBACH, *University of Michigan.*

Working for the People: Promise and Performance in Public Service. BY ROBERT MOSES. (New York: Harper and Brothers. 1956. Pp. x, 283. $4.50.)

Robert Moses has for a long time exemplified all that is best in the tradition of the public service. The range of his activities in politics and public administration at every level of operation is fabulous indeed. Perhaps his extensive work has been possible because, as Herbert B. Swope suggests in a brief foreword, Mr. Moses knows how to trust people and can delegate authority. Mr. Moses himself later notes that he believes in delegation, but "to the right people, not to stooges, clockwatchers, trimmers and incompetents."

This book consists of a number of speeches, letters, articles, reports, and interviews, assembled and edited by a friend. These materials are divided into twenty chapters, some of which overlap, dealing with the following matters: theory and practice in politics, recruitment for the public service; planning problems of the metropolitan area with specific emphasis on New York City, the role of government in housing, parks and museums in large urban areas, conservation of natural resources, the automobile and highway construction, and preparation for the public service. Many political scientists of varied interests should find the book worthwhile. Nevertheless, it has most to contribute to whose who are concerned principally with public administration and American local government. Some of the author's insights into major contemporary problems under discussion, such as the national highway program, are extremely useful.

The book is written in a lively, breezy style. It is full of interesting anecdotes. In addition, the author's personal philosophy and orientation are revealed clearly. Mr. Moses is revealed as a man of strong, independent ideas. Some of his somewhat dogmatic assertions tend to oversimplify certain problems. For example, he seems to feel that greater interest in government by the electorate would automatically result in better governmental administration (pp. 14, 15). In another instance he asserts that "Proportional representation is the architect of communism and disorder" (p. 17).

Despite somewhat minor flaws, the book is well worth reading. Mr. Moses is an exuberant, optimistic public servant. Although keenly aware of the severe handicaps and problems of the public service, he is not a cynic. He is firmly convinced that the major governmental problems can be solved in the interest of a better American way of life. We must have "vision and idealism" and "creative realism to give them meaning."—R. J. Tresolini, *Lehigh University.*

Democracy and the American Party System. By Austin Ranney and Willmoore Kendall. (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1956. Pp. xiv, 550. $5.75.)

The authors, a "liberal Democrat . . . [and] a conservative Republican" ask whether "the American party system is a valuable agency of democratic government" and answer affirmatively. Beginning with an examination of democratic theory and constructing a verbal democratic model, of which formal majoritarianism (to which both writers are committed) is a feature, they then examine political parties historically and comparatively as facilitating democratic institutions; and they further examine the emergence of immanent attitudes toward parties from righteous rejection through suspicious tolerance to indifferent and (for some, at least) enthusiastic acceptance. All this forms a background for discussing American parties—their structure (competitive and one-party situations, membership, and formal and informal organizations) as well as their major activities (nominating, electing, and governing). Minor parties are scrutinized, and the book culminates in a sketch of the American political environment against which the function of the political parties is further described and evaluated; the conclusion rejects the APSA Committee's report "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System."

Registration of Voters in Alabama. By Donald S. Strong. (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Bureau of Public Administration. 1956. Pp. vi, 135.)

"Registration of voters is both a record-keeping process and a method of restricting the electorate." Each aspect is presented with clarity in this study. The registration process appears as the most recent in a long series of efforts to disfranchise the negro. It is also an effective deterrent for the uninterested or poorly educated white. The author suggests that local variations in administration of state law correspond to variations in the social situation. A special questionnaire used only in Montgomery to discourage labor voting would disfranchise many readers of this journal. The report concludes with carefully considered recommendations for improvement.

Letter to a Generation. By Ralph E. Flanders. (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1956. Pp. 116. $2.50.)

This is a strongly moral exhortation to work towards peace and freedom for all peoples. It is not noteworthy for originality of thought or newness of phrase and gives the impression that symbols can do it all, as in the late Helen Hokinson's cartoons. The book is none the less a respectable tract by a good and very admirable humanitarian.

A Catholic Runs for President: The Campaign of 1928. By Edmund A. Moore. (New York: The Ronald Press Company. 1956. Pp. xii, 220. $3.50.)

This book reviews the polemics excited by Al Smith's campaign for the presidency. Contemporary statements are quoted freely. The author concludes that the religious issue in the Smith-Hoover contest is difficult to separate from others and that religion is still a potentially divisive force in American politics.

The Fabulous Democrats: A History of the Democratic Party in Text and Pictures. By David L. Cohn. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1956. Pp. 192. $5.95.)

A simplified history of the Democratic Party with numerous illustrations. A highly favorable view of the subject.

Eisenhower the President. By Merlo J. Pusey. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1956. Pp. 300. $3.75.)

The story of the President and his admintration as they have moved without interrup- ion from success to success. Suitable for cam- aign use by Republican committees.

he Hoover Report 1953–1955: What It Means to You as Citizen and Taxpayer. By Neil MacNeil and Harold W. Metz. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1956. Pp. vi, 344. $6.00.)

A popular summary by the Commission's hief editor and research director. Chapters re devoted to the various reports of the ommission, whose conservative temper and ttitudes are evidently shared by the authors f this book.

arty Politics. By Ivan Hinderaker. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1956. Pp. x, 694. $6.50.)

Basically a discursive commentary on the olitical practices developed by the federal wo-party organization. Strong theoretical ast which obstructs systematic unification of he subject. Much shrewd analysis but mixed t important points with superficial definition. leasant style. Many pictorial illustrations.

he Two-Party System in the United States. By William Goodman. (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc. 1956. Pp. xii, 649. $6.00.)

This textbook differs from other texts in the eld by giving a reasoned account of the auses which produced the two-party system ith its characteristic political behavior. xpository and analytical rather than histori- al in its method. Neatly tied in with the usual escriptive material. Closely written with uent style. Charts and tables.

ublic Finance and Economic Welfare. By Kenyon E. Poole. (New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc. 1956. Pp. xvi, 640. $6.50.)

A systematic and well integrated treatment f fiscal policy is contained in this text. Note- orthy inclusions are: the development of ell defined norms; the thorough treatment f Keynesian employment theory; the dis- ussion of the interrelationships of monetary nd fiscal policy; and the impact of fiscal policy n the distribution of income. Approximately ne-third of the book is concerned with taxation *per se*. Also included is an interesting and valuable discussion of intergovernmental fiscal relations. Particularly welcome is the thoroughgoing orientation of the analysis and the policy proposals to the important social problems of stability and growth.

Public Control of Economic Enterprise. By Harold Koontz and Richard W. Gable. (New York, Toronto, London: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1956. Pp. xii, 851. $7.00.)

An encyclopedia of description is provided by the authors of this textbook. Control, beyond anti-trust legislation, is construed by the authors to include even monetary, fiscal, and direct controls. The meaning of economic enterprise is extended to include transportation, public utilities, labor, agriculture, and finance, in addition to manufacturing. In order to judge the desirability and efficacy of controls, the norms of results need to be more clearly and consistently set forth by the authors. In addition, a knowledge of the structure, behavior, and results of the economy beyond that to be gained from the text is necessary in order to evaluate controls. The text is suited to the control portion of an industrial organization-public policy course when this broad type of coverage is desired.

The Development of American Petroleum Pipelines: A Study in Private Enterprise and Public Policy, 1862–1906. By Arthur Menzies Johnson. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1956. Pp. xiii, 307. $4.50.)

The thesis developed in this historical work is that the control of pipelines was a major instrument in the formation of the structure of the petroleum industry. Also, the thesis is advanced that public policy in the early period was oriented and used to enhance the position of particular firms, notably Standard Oil, rather than to gain material welfare for the consumer. Although these points in this useful study appear convincing, the various judgments of the author concerning the role of public policy in this area as opposed to other areas and the influence of the historical development of the period on the future development of the industry and of policy are not proved in this volume.

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON
AMERICAN GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

FRANKLIN L. BURDETTE
University of Maryland

ARTICLES AND BOOKLETS

National Government

Acheson, Dean. Legislative-Executive Relations. *Yale Review.* June, 1956.

Bartley, Ernest R. The President and Congress. *Social Science.* June, 1956.

Immigration. [Symposium.] *Law and Contemporary Problems.* Spring, 1956.

Maloney, Walter H., Jr. Involuntary Loss of American Citizenship. *Saint Louis University Law Journal.* Spring, 1956.

Mulder, William. Immigration and the "Mormon Question": An International Episode. *Western Political Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Postal Rate Increase. [Symposium.] *Congressional Digest.* June-July, 1956.

Schneider, Henry. Aliens and the United States Income Tax—1956. *Taxes.* September, 1956.

Surrey, Stanley S. Current Issues in the Taxation of Corporate Foreign Investment. *Columbia Law Review.* June, 1956.

State Government

Friedman, Robert S. A Selected Bibliography of Maryland State and Local Government. Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Maryland. 1956.

The Governors' Conference, 1956. *State Government.* August, 1956.

Judah, Charles B., and Frederick C. Irion. The 47th State: An Appraisal of Its Government. Division of Government Research, University of New Mexico. 1956.

Langlie, Arthur B. The Responsibility of the States and Their Governors. *State Government.* August, 1956.

Morrow, Glenn D. State Constitutional Limitations on the Taxing Authority of State Legislatures. *National Tax Journal.* June, 1956.

Scott, Stanley. Streamlining State Legislatures. Bureau of Public Administration, University of California, Berkeley. 1956.

State Control Over Watercraft. Illinois Legislative Council. 1956.

A Symposium on Legislation. *Louisiana Law Review.* June, 1956.

Local Government

Arnold, David S. Sources of Managemen Information. *Public Management.* Augus 1956.

Bailey, Stephen K. Leadership in Loc Government. *Yale Review.* June, 1956.

City Consolidation in the Lower Peninsul Bureau of Public Administration, Universit of Virginia. 1956.

Gillespie, John. Government in Metropolitan Austin. Institute of Public Affairs, University of Texas. 1956.

Gulick, Luther H. The Coming Age o Cities. Institute of Local Government, University of Pittsburgh. 1956.

Hall, James K. Sales-Assessment Rati Survey in Washington. *National Tax Journa* June, 1956.

Kallen, Horace M. City Planning and th Idea of the City: Considerations Especiall About New York. *Social Research.* Summe 1956.

Lloyd, William J. Tort Liability of Municipalities for Defects in Streets and Sidewalk *Syracuse Law Review.* Spring, 1956.

Mars, David. The Government of th Connecticut County. *County Officer.* June 1956.

Municipal Inducements to Private Industry *Minnesota Law Review.* May, 1956.

Parking: Legal, Financial, Administrative Eno Foundation for Highway Traffic Control Saugatuck, Conn. 1956.

Planning and Building for Better Living i Cities and Counties. Department of City an Regional Planning, University of California Berkeley. 1956.

Wagner, Robert F. 1956 Federal Legislativ Round-up of Bills with Municipal Interest *Western City.* August, 1956.

Intergovernmental Relations

Anderson, William. The Commission o Intergovernmental Relations and the Unite States Federal System. *Journal of Politic* May, 1956.

Chute, Charlton F. Today's Urban Region *National Municipal Review.* June, 1956. II *Ibid.* July, 1956.

Federal Expenditures in Washington. ureau of Business Research, University of ashington. 1956.

Heller, Francis H. Our Stake in the Federal ystem. Governmental Research Center, Uni-rsity of Kansas. 1956.

Jones, Victor, and John E. Bebout. Meeting Minds, Ideas [on Metropolitan Problems]. *ational Municipal Review.* June, 1956.

Mushkin, Selma J. Distribution of Federal axes Among the States. *National Tax urnal.* June, 1956.

State Aid to Local Government. Department Audit and Control, State of New York. ugust, 1956.

Constitutional Law and Civil Liberties

Abrams, Charles. Civil Rights in 1956. *Com-entary.* August, 1956.

Constitutional Restrictions on a Lessee of ublic Property. *Virginia Law Review.* June, 56.

Crosskey, William Winslow. John Marshall nd the Constitution. *University of Chicago aw Review.* Spring, 1956.

Dembitz, Nanette. Congressional Investiga-on of Newspapermen, Authors, and Others the Opinion Field—Its Legality under the irst Amendment. *Minnesota Law Review.* pril, 1956.

The Doctrine of Interposition: A Round able. *Journal of Public Law.* Spring, 1956.

Dunbar, Leslie W. James Madison and the inth Amendment. *Virginia Law Review.* une, 1956.

Gardner, George K. Free Speech in Public laces. *Boston University Law Review.* Spring, 956.

Horowitz, Harold W. Legal Aspects of Political Black Listing" in the Entertainment ndustry. *Southern California Law Review.* pril, 1956.

McDonough, John R., Jr. Mr. Justice ackson and Full Faith and Credit to Divorce ecrees: A Critique. *Columbia Law Review.* une, 1956.

Nineteenth Century Judicial Thought Con-erning Church-State Relations. *Minnesota aw Review.* May, 1956.

Pittman, R. Carter. The Fifth Amendment: esterday, Today and Tomorrow. *American ar Association Journal.* June, 1956.

Judicial Administration and Law Enforcement

Abernathy, Glenn. Organization and Juris-liction of the Courts of South Carolina. Bureau of Public Administration, University of South Carolina. 1956.

Buiteweg, Joannes. History of Michigan's One-Man Grand Jury. *University of Detroit Law Journal.* May, 1956.

Cohen, Julius. The "Good Man" and the Role of Reason in Legislative Law. *Cornell Law Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

Dixon, Robert G., Jr. Judicial Administration in Maryland—The Administrative Office of the Courts. *Maryland Law Review.* Spring, 1956. Part II. *Ibid.* Summer, 1956.

Douglas, William O. The Durham Rule: A Meeting Ground for Lawyers and Psychiatrists. *Iowa Law Review.* Summer, 1956.

Foote, Caleb. Vagrancy-Type Law and Its Administration. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review.* March, 1956.

Foster, G. W., Jr. Personal Jurisdiction Based on Local Causes of Action. *Wisconsin Law Review.* July, 1956.

Greenberg, Jack. Social Scientists Take the Stand: A Review and Appraisal of Their Testimony in Litigation. *Michigan Law Review.* May, 1956.

Jones, Walter B. Trial by Jury in Alabama. *Alabama Law Review.* Spring, 1956.

Justice Delayed. *Journal of the American Judicature Society.* June, 1956.

Law and the Future: A Symposium. *Northwestern University Law Review.* May-June, 1956.

Report of the New York State Joint Legislative Committee Studying the Publication and Dissemination of Objectionable and Obscene Materials. Legislative Document No. 32. 1956.

Ross, Russell M. The Iowa Judicial System. *Iowa Journal of History.* April, 1956.

Simon, David. The Attorney-Client Privilege as Applied to Corporations. *Yale Law Journal.* June, 1956.

Some Aspects of the California Grand Jury System. *Stanford Law Review.* July, 1956.

Stevens, Robert S. A Plea for the Extension of Equitable Principles and Remedies. *Cornell Law Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

Submission of Lesser Crimes. *Columbia Law Review.* June, 1956.

Swartz, Aaron S., Jr. Compulsory Arbitration: An Experiment in Pennsylvania. *American Bar Association Journal.* June, 1956.

Thompson, Raymond. Court Etiquette. *Journal of the State Bar of California.* July-August, 1956.

Vanderbilt, Arthur T. Impasses in Justice. *Washington University Law Quarterly.* June, 1956.

———. The Municipal Court—The Most Important Court in New Jersey; Its Remarkable Progress and Its Unsolved Problems. *Rutgers Law Review.* Summer, 1956.

Williamson, Hugh P. A Curious Checkerboard: Disparate Rules of Admission in Federal Courts. *American Bar Association Journal.* August, 1956.

Winters, Glenn R. Newsfronts of Judicial Reform. *Journal of the American Judicature Society.* June, 1956.

Wright, Charles Alan. A Primer of Practical Evidence. *Minnesota Law Review.* May, 1956.

Public Administration and Administrative Law

Aaron, Roy H. Scope of Judicial Review of Local Administrative Agencies in California. *Southern California Law Review.* April, 1956.

Ansley, Norman. The United States Secret Service: An Administrative History. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science.* May-June, 1956.

Apprisal, Confrontation and the Passport Applicant. *Stanford Law Review.* July, 1956.

Berger, Philip R. A Lesson in Cooperation. *Public Administration Review.* Summer, 1956.

Brownlow, Louis. Woodrow Wilson and Public Administration. *Public Administration Review.* Spring, 1956.

California Administrative Law. [Symposium.] *California Law Review.* May, 1956.

Competitors' Standing to Challenge Administrative Action under the APA. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review.* April, 1956.

Demerath, Nicholas J., and John W. Thibaut. Small Groups and Administrative Organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly.* September, 1956.

Dotson, Arch. A General Theory of Public Employment. *Public Administration Review.* Summer, 1956.

Eichstedt, John H. Payments in Lieu of Taxes on Public Lands under the Jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Conservation. Bureau of Government, Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan. 1956.

Ficek, Karel F. After the Therblig—What? *Public Administration Review.* Summer, 1956.

Heady, Ferrel, and Robert H. Pealy. The Michigan Department of Administration: A Case Study in the Politics of Administration. *Public Administration Review.* Spring, 1956.

Helstad, Orrin L. New Law on Administrative Rule Making [in Wisconsin]. *Wisconsin Law Review.* May, 1956.

Joy, James V. The Disputes Clause in Government Contracts: A Survey of Cou and Administrative Decisions. *Fordham La Review.* Spring, 1956.

Kessler, Samuel L. The New York Sta Interdepartmental Committee on Metho and Procedures, 1947–1956. *Public Admini tration Review.* Spring, 1956.

Krislov, Joseph. Unemployment Compens tion for Public Employees. *Public Personn Review.* July, 1956.

Lappegaard, Ray. A Look at Some Admi istrative Problems. *Public Administratio Review.* Summer, 1956.

Litchfield, Edward H. Notes on a Gener Theory of Administration. *Administrati Science Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Lystad, Mary H., and Robert C. Ston Bureaucratic Mass Media: A Study in Ro Definitions. *Social Forces.* May, 1956.

McClelland, C. S. The Covenant Again Contingent Fees as a Method of Eliminatin the "5-Percenter." *Cornell Law Quarterl* Spring, 1956.

McEwen, William J. Position Conflict an Professional Orientation in a Research Orga ization. *Administrative Science Quarterly.* Se tember, 1956.

McGurrin, James J. Special Problems i Federal Personnel Management Abroad. *Pu lic Personnel Review.* July, 1956.

Millett, John D. A Critical Appraisal of th Study of Public Administration. *Administr tive Science Quarterly.* September, 1956.

Morgan, Glenn G. On Being an Intern—an Afterward. *Public Administration Revie* Spring, 1956.

Mosher, Frederick C. Research in Publi Administration: Some Notes and Suggestion *Public Administration Review.* Summer, 195

Netterville, Victor S. The Substanti Evidence Rule in California Administrati Law. *Stanford Law Review.* July, 1956.

Pealy, Robert H. A Comparative Study Property Tax Administration in Illinois an Michigan. Bureau of Government, Institut of Public Administration, University of Mich gan. 1956.

Rao, Paul P. Customs Administration an Law. *Fordham Law Review.* Spring, 1956.

Reining, Henry. Recent Advances in Publi Administration. *County Officer.* July-Augus 1956.

Stark, Maurice E. Claims for Refund Federal Taxes. *Iowa Law Review.* Summe 1956.

Symposium on the Proposed Administrativ

ourt. *George Washington Law Review.* June, 56.

Wells, Henry. Reorganization in Puerto ico. *Western Political Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Political Parties, Elections, and Public Opinion

An Analysis of Senator John W. Bricker's eport Entitled "The Network Monopoly." olumbia Broadcasting System. June, 1956.

Bloom, Arnold. Tax Results of Political ontributions. *Boston University Law Review.* pring, 1956.

Bradford, Robert F. Republicans and inners. *Harvard Business Review.* July-ugust, 1956.

Buchanan, William. An Inquiry Into Purosive Voting. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1956.

Changing American Politics. [Symposium.] *urrent History.* August, 1956.

Doss, Richard B. Inside the Democratic ational Convention of 1904. *Virginia Magane of History and Biography.* July, 1956.

Enoch, Kurt. The Mass Media: Challenge/ himera? *Essential Books.* June, 1956.

Epstein, Leon D. American Parties: A Visconsin Case Study. *Political Studies.* ebruary, 1956.

Eulau, Heinz. Identification with Class and olitical Perspective. *Journal of Politics.* May, 956.

Gatlin, Douglas S., and Bruce B. Mason. eapportionment: Its History in Florida. ublic Administration Clearing Service, Uniersity of Florida. 1956.

Janowitz, Morris, and Dwaine Marvick. ompetitive Pressure and Democratic Conent. Bureau of Government, Institute of ublic Administration, University of Michgan. 1956.

Lasswell, Harold D. The Decision Process: even Categories of Functional Analysis. Bueau of Governmental Research, University f Maryland. 1956.

MacDonald, James C. Press Relations for ocal Officials. Institute of Public Adminisration, University of Michigan. 1956.

Marbut, Frederick B. Decline of the Official ress in Washington. *Journalism Quarterly.* ummer, 1956.

McCoy, Donald R. The Progressive Naional Committee of 1936. *Western Political uarterly.* June, 1956.

Mitau, G. Theodore. The Status of Political Party Organization in Minnesota Law. *Minneota Law Review.* April, 1956.

Naftalin, Arthur. The Tradition of Protest and the Roots of the Farmer-Labor Party. *Minnesota History.* June, 1956.

Network Practices. Columbia Broadcasting System. June, 1956.

Ogburn, William F., and Charles M. Grigg. Factors Related to the Virginia Vote on Segregation. *Social Forces.* May, 1956.

Pollack, Jack Harrison. They'll Steal Your Vote. *National Municipal Review.* July, 1956.

Pool, Ithiel de Sola, ed. Studies in Political Communication. [Symposium.] *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

Reissman, Leonard, K. H. Silvert, and Cliff W. Wing, Jr. The New Orleans Voter: A Handbook of Political Description. Tulane Studies in Political Science, Vol. II. 1955. [1956.]

Reock, Ernest C., Jr., and Stanley H. Friedelbaum. Congressional Districting in New Jersey. Bureau of Government Research, Rutgers University. 1956.

Ridge, Martin. Ignatius Donnelly and the Granger Movement in Minnesota. *Mississippi Valley Historical Review.* March, 1956.

Rogers, Lindsay. U. S. Political Party System. *Think.* June, 1956.

Scammon, Richard M. Washington Votes Again. *National Municipal Review.* July, 1956.

Smuckler, Ralph H., and George M. Belknap. Leadership and Participation in Urban Political Affairs. Government Research Bureau, Michigan State University. 1956.

Sweeting, Orville J. John Q. Tilson and the Reapportionment Act of 1929. *Western Political Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Vines, Kenneth N. Republicanism in New Orleans. Tulane Studies in Political Science, Vol. II. 1955. [1956.]

Economic and Social Functions

National Economy

Baratz, Morton S. Corporate Giants and the Power Structure. *Western Political Quarterly.* June, 1956.

The Budget, the Economy and Tax Reduction in 1956. Committee for Economic Development. June, 1956.

Federal Excise Taxes. Tax Foundation. 1956.

Kaltenbach, Henry J. The Federal Highway Program and Its Significance to Real Estate. *The Appraisal Journal.* July, 1956.

Ritter, Lawrence S. Functional Finance and the Banking System. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* July, 1956.

A Symposium on the Legal Aspects of an Atomic Era. *Texas Law Review.* June, 1956.

Agriculture

American Farm Policy. [Symposium.] *Current History*. September, 1956.

Federal Farm Policy. [Symposium.] *Congressional Digest*. August-September, 1956.

Knapp, David C. Congressional Control of Agricultural Conservation Policy. A Case Study of the Appropriations Process. *Political Science Quarterly*. June, 1956.

Liss, Samuel. Farm Wage Boards under the Wage Stabilization Program during World War II. *Agricultural History*. July, 1956.

Ryan, John L. Government Regulations Affecting the Value of Agricultural Properties. *The Appraisal Journal*. July, 1956.

Shideler, James H. Herbert Hoover and the Federal Farm Board Project, 1921–1925. *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*. March, 1956.

Business and Labor

Alexander, John H., and William B. Landis, Jr. Bail-outs and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. *Yale Law Journal*. June, 1956.

Edwards, Corwin D. Twenty Years of the Robinson-Patman Act. *Journal of Business*. July, 1956.

Graham, Howard Jay. "Builded Better Than They Knew." Part 1: The Framers, the Railroads and the Fourteenth Amendment. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*. Summer, 1956.

Kaye, Stephen Rackow. Are "Conventional Methods" Necessary in Natural Gas Rate Regulation? *Cornell Law Quarterly*. Spring, 1956.

Kharas, Ralph E., and Robert F. Koretz. Judicial Determination of the Arbitrable Issue in Labor Arbitration—Some Recent Developments. *Syracuse Law Review*. Spring, 1956.

Koretz, Robert F. The Lockout Revisited. *Syracuse Law Review*. Spring, 1956.

McConnell, Campbell R. Pros and Cons of the Guaranteed Annual Wage. *Labor Law Journal*. July, 1956.

McGee, John S. Price Discrimination and Competitive Effects: The Standard Oil of Indiana Case. *University of Chicago Law Review*. Spring, 1956.

Morgan, Chester A. Unions and State Antitrust Laws. *Labor Law Journal*. July, 1956.

Rains, Harry H. The Current Status of Organizational or Recognition Picketing. *Labor Law Journal*. September, 1956.

Regulation of Employee Benefit Plans: Activate the Law of Trusts. *Stanford Law Review*. July, 1956.

Sandler, Woodrow J. NLRB Administrative Rulings Concerning the "24–Hour Rule." *Labor Law Journal*. September, 1956.

Securities and Exchange Commission Regulation of Proxy Contests. *Harvard Law Review*. June, 1956.

Shubik, Martin. A Game Theorist Looks at the Antitrust Laws and the Automobile Industry. *Stanford Law Review*. July, 1956.

State Mediation in 1956: Problems and Prospects. [Symposium.] *Labor Law Journal*. August, 1956.

Stone, David O. Assignment of Employee Accident Claims and the Conflict of Laws. *Syracuse Law Review*. Spring, 1956.

———. The Forum's Policy and the Defense of Faith and Credit to Workmen's Compensation Acts. *Iowa Law Review*. Summer, 1956.

Strong, George E. Role of the Lawyer in Arbitration, Mediation and Conciliation. *Labor Law Journal*. July, 1956.

A Symposium on the Federal Regulation of Natural-Gas Producers. *Georgetown Law Journal*. June, 1956.

Vile, M. J. C. Federalism and Labor Regulation in the United States and Australia. *Political Science Quarterly*. June, 1956.

Wyle, Benjamin. Unions in Search of a Forum to Enforce Contracts. *Labor Law Journal*. July, 1956.

Health, Education, and Welfare

Bolmeier, E. C. Legality and Propriety of Religious Instruction in the Public Schools. *Educational Forum*. May, 1956.

Campbell, Donald F., Jr. The Social Security Act: Twenty Years Experience. *Journal of Accountancy*. August, 1956.

Elkins, Eugene R., and Larry Young. Public Health Administration in West Virginia. Bureau for Government Research, West Virginia University. 1956.

Freeman, Roger A. Crisis in School Finance. Part II: How Can Rising School Needs Be Financed? *National Tax Journal*. June, 1956.

McKay, Robert B. "With All Deliberate Speed": A Study of School Desegregation. *New York University Law Review*. June, 1956.

Perkins, Ellen J. State and Local Financing of Public Assistance, 1935–55. *Social Security Bulletin*. July, 1956.

Military Affairs and National Security

Avins, Alfred. State Court Review of National Guard Courts-Martial and Military Board Decisions. *Cornell Law Quarterly*. Spring, 1956.

Everett, Robinson O. Persons Who Can Be ried by Court-Martial. *Journal of Public aw.* Spring, 1956.

Misconduct in the Prison Camp: A Survey the Law and an Analysis of the Korean ases. *Columbia Law Review.* May, 1956.

Pasley, Robert S. Sentence First—Verdict fterwards: Dishonorable Discharges without rial by Court-Martial? *Cornell Law Quar- rly.* Summer, 1956.

Peterson, Val. Civil Defense and Law. *ebraska Law Review.* March, 1956.

Prugh, George S., Jr. The Code of Conduct r the Armed Forces. *Columbia Law Review.* ay, 1956.

Walsh, William F. Military Law: Return to rumhead Justice? *American Bar Association ournal.* June, 1956.

Government Documents

ongress

House. Committee on Agriculture. Cotton utures Contracts. Hearings before Subcom- ittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Farm Credit. Hearings be- re Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 56.

———— ————. Miscellaneous Credit. Hear- g before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd ess. 1956.

————. Committee on Armed Services. ommercial Use of Selective Service Forms. eport and Hearings before Subcommittee. 4th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Banking and Cur- ncy. Area Assistance Act of 1956. Hearings. 4th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Housing Act of 1956. Hear- gs. Also House Report No. 2363. 84th Cong., d Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Education and abor. Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's ompensation Act. Hearings before Subcom- ittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Minimum Wages for Puerto ico and the Virgin Islands. Hearings. 84th ong. 1956.

———— ————. Proposed Amendments to ublic Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (As- stance to Federally Affected School Dis- icts). Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th ong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. To Promote the Education f the Blind. Hearing before Subcommittee. lso House Report No. 2771. 84th Cong., 2nd ess. 1956.

————. Committee on Foreign Affairs. Foreign Affairs Advisory Board. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1956. Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Mutual Security Act of 1956. Hearings. Also House Reports Nos. 2213, 2643. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Government Operations. Administration of Surplus Property Disposal. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 1st Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Employment of Experts and Consultants by Federal Agencies. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. The General Accounting Office: A Study of Its Organization and Administration with Recommendations for Increasing Its Effectiveness. House Report No. 2264. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Inquiry into the Expansion and Operation by General Services Administration of the Government Nickel Plant at Nicaro, Cuba. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also House Report No. 2390. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1956 (New Offices in the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force). Hearing before Subcommittee. Also House Report No. 2585. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956 (Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation). Hearing before Subcommittee. Also House Report No. 2599. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. To Simplify Accounting, Facilitate the Payment of Obligations, and for Other Purposes. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on House Administration. Paperwork Management. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Withdrawal and Utilization of the Public Lands of the United States. Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Automobile Marketing Legislation. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong. 1956.

———— ————. Communications Act Amendments. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also House Report No. 2540. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Chemical Additives in Food). Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Health Amendments Act of 1956. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also House Report No. 2569. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. State Taxation of Interstate Trucking and the Reciprocity Problem. Staff Report. House Doc. No. 449. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Trip Leasing (Interstate Commerce Act). Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on the Judiciary. Appeal of Administrative Agency Decisions. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Automobile Dealer Franchises. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also House Report No. 2850. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Establishment of a National Policy for Commercial Fisheries. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Liberalized Civil Service Retirement Benefits. House Report No. 2854. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Scientific, Professional, and Administrative Positions to Promote the National Defense. Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Study of Manpower Utilization and Personnel Management in the Federal Government. House Report No. 2961. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Public Works. Rivers and Harbors and Beach Erosion Omnibus Bill. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also House Report No. 2639. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Rules. Civil Rights. Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Proposed Establishment of Committee on Administrative Procedure and Practice. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Un-American Activities. Investigation of Communist Activities in the Rocky Mountain Area. Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Barring Payment of Pension to Veterans Imprisoned for More than 60 Days—Restricting Payments to Beneficiaries of Certain Veteran Hearings before Subcommittee. Also Hou Report No. 2584. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 195

———— ————. Findings and Recommend tions of the President's Commission on Ve erans' Pensions (Bradley Commission). Hea ings. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Ways and Mean Organization for Trade Cooperation. Hearing 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Renegotiation Amendmen Act of 1956. House Report No. 2549. 84t Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Select Committee on Small Bus ness. The Organization and Procedures of th Federal Regulatory Commissions and Agenci and Their Effect on Small Business. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Ses 1956.

House and Senate. Committee on Interi and Insular Affairs, Senate, and Committe on Government Operations, House. The A Sarena Case. Joint hearings before Subcommittees. Also House Report No. 2408. 84t Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Joint Committee on Atomic Energy Civilian Atomic Power Acceleration Program Hearing. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Governmental Indemnity Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Sale of Communities. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also House Repor No. 2693. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Shortage of Scientific an Engineering Manpower. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Joint Committee on the Economi Report. Conflicting Official Views on Monetar Policy: April 1956. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Defense Essentiality an Foreign Economic Policy (Case Study: Th Watch Industry and Precision Skills). Hearings before Subcommittee. Also Senate Repor No. 2629. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

Senate. Committee on Agriculture an Forestry. Administration of Farm Program by Farmer Committees. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———— ————. Farm Credit Act of 1956 Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong. 2nd Sess. 1956.

————. Committee on Armed Services Military Public Works Construction. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess 1956.

———— ————. Study of Airpower. Hear-gs before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd ss. 1956.

———. Committee on Banking and Cur- ncy. Regulation of Bank Mergers. Hearings fore Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 56.

———. Committee on Finance. Methods of etermining Value of Imported Goods for uty Purposes. Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd ss. 1956.

——— ———. Survivor Benefit Act. Hear- gs. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———. Committee on Foreign Relations. utual Security Act of 1956. Hearings. 84th ong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———. Committee on Government Opera- ons. Budgeting and Accounting. Hearings efore Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 56.

——— ———. Communist Interrogation, ndoctrination and Exploitation of American ilitary and Civilian Prisoners. Hearings be- r Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Reorganization of Safety unctions of the Federal Government. Hear- g before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd ess. 1956.

——— ———. Reorganization Plan No. 2 f 1956. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th ong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———. Committee on Interior and Insular ffairs. Extension of Purchase Programs of trategic and Critical Minerals. Hearings be- re Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 956.

——— ———. Hawaii Reapportionment. earing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., nd Session. 1956.

——— ———. Nomination of Wesley A. 'Ewart to be Assistant Secretary of the nterior. Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ——— and Committee on Public orks. Conservation and Development of ater Resources. Joint Hearings. 84th Cong., nd Sess. 1956.

———. Committee on Interstate and For- ign Commerce. Amending Interstate Com- erce Act (To Alleviate Freight Car Shortage). earings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Amendments to Public tility Holding Company Act, 1935. Hearings efore Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 956.

——— ———. Merchant Marine Legisla- ion. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th ong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. New Ship Construction. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Permanent Certification for Alaska-Hawaii Airlines. Hearing. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Study of Operation of Civil Aeronautics Administration. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. The Television Inquiry: Allocations Phase. Senate Report No. 2769. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———. Committee on the Judiciary. To Amend Section 2 of the Clayton Act. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Amendments to Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Balancing of the Budget. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Equal Rights. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Federal-State Concurrent Jurisdiction. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Jurisdiction in Sedition Cases. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Juvenile Delinquency: Commercial Child Adoption Practices. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Legislation Affecting Corporate Mergers. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Nomination of Simon E. Sobeloff. Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Return of Confiscated Property. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Taxes on Incomes, Inheritances, and Gifts. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Area Redevelopment. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also Senate Report No. 2555. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Federal Advisory Council on the Arts. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Railroad Retirement. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Veterans' Loan Guaranty

Program. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Administration of the Federal Employees' Security Program. Senate Report No. 2750. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. F.H.A. Investigation. Hearings before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———. Committee on Public Works. Amending the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act. Hearing before Subcommittee. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———. Report of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation Relating to Renegotiation. Senate Doc. No. 126. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

———. Select Committee on Small Business. Motion-Picture Distribution Trade Practices—1956. Hearings before Subcommittee. Also Senate Report No. 2818. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Small Business Administration—1956. Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 1956.

——— ———. Supply and Distribution (Nickel. Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd Sess. 195

Other Federal

Department of Agriculture. Gradua School. Democracy in Federal Administratio Edited by O. B. Conaway, Jr. 1956.

Department of the Army. Adjutant Ge eral's Office. Army Library. United State National Security. Special Bibliography N 7. 1956.

National Academy of Sciences—Nation Research Council. The Biological Effects (Atomic Radiation. Summary Reports. Als A Report to the Public. 1956.

National Science Foundation. Organizatio of the Federal Government for Scientifi Activities. 1956.

President's Committee on Government Con tracts. A Manual for the Guidance of Person nel Engaged in Obtaining Compliance with th National Equal Job Opportunity Program 1956.

Small Business Administration. Technica Aids for Small Business. Edited by J. Wad Rice. 1956.

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

Modern Political Parties: Approaches to Comparative Politics. EDITED BY SIGMUND NEUMANN. WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY FREDERICK C. BARGHOORN, SAMUEL H. BEER, GWENDOLEN M. CARTER, ANDREW GYORGY, CHARLES A. MICAUD, SIGMUND NEUMANN, FELIX E. OPPENHEIM, DANKWART A. RUSTOW, ROBERT A. SCALAPINO, AND E. E. SCHATTSCHNEIDER. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1956. Pp. xii, 460. $7.50.)

This should prove to be a widely used reference book on comparative party systems. It contains separate expositions of democratic party systems in Great Britain, the British self-governing dominions, France, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, and the United States. There are also treatments of the one-party systems of the Soviet Union and of the East European satellites. The present German and Japanese party systems are also presented, with extensive background material on the earlier political systems of those countries.

In all cases the treatment is basically functional, without excessive emphasis upon formal structure though the more important features of party structure are adequatel presented. Party functioning is discussed i relation to appropriate phases of historica background and of social context. Each section is written by a specialist in the area o country concerned.

These studies were made independently in so far as no general conceptual framewor was imposed, but in the hope that they migh contribute to a needed general theory of political parties. Toward this goal very little ha been attained. This is probably to be expecte of a project which attempts "a simultaneou attack on both theory and practice" an which employs area specialists in the presentation of all the empirical material.

There are introductory and concludin essays by the editor. The latter essay summarizes the more or less accepted theoretica considerations as to democratic party system —the different functioning of two-party and multi-party systems and the historical sequence of different types of parties in Wester Europe—and also characterizes a number o questions for study in the development of a modern "sociology of parties." For the most rt these latter considerations are merely ggestive. As the editor suggests in the intro- ctory essay, genuine comparison is seriously mpered in this as in other aspects of com- rative government because "we are still ing within an ideological framework of a ndred years back." In this as in other areas political generalization it is probable that rious progress will depend upon the intro- ction of new classificatory concepts which ill draw distinctions more fruitful in an plicative sense than those secured by the plication of the traditional concepts.—G. OWELL FIELD, *The University of Connecticut.*

he Political Role of Women. BY MAURICE DUVERGER. (Paris: UNESCO. 1955. Pp. 221. $2.50.)

The scope of this book is far more limited an its title suggests. The work is based on a latively small body of statistics drawn from ly four countries—France, the German ederal Republic, Norway, and Yugoslavia— d indeed from rather inadequate material en for these four. None the less, the conclu- ons the study reaches and certainly the uestions it asks are important. The book ould serve as a pioneer venture in a field hich needs far more exploration.

The Political Role of Women is divided into wo sections: the part women play in elections nd the part they play in political leadership. s can be expected, the survey finds that in e countries under consideration the role of omen in parliament, local government, the ivil service, and political parties is far less an their numbers as voters might suggest. art of the reason, in M. Duverger's view, is ale opposition to sharing positions of im- ortance; no less or perhaps even more im- ortant is the general assumption that politics a man's field, an assumption made no less idely by women themselves than by men. hether women's continued use of the fran- hise will help to break down this assumption, s M. Duverger suggests, remains to be seen. ven in the United States, groups like the eague of Women Voters and the women's olleges have done little enough as yet to hange this view, as he himself comments in he report he presented to the Political Science ongress at The Hague in 1952, which is eprinted as one of the four appendices of the ook.

What the study suggests about women's se of their franchise is again not unexpected ut also not unimportant. On the whole, married women were found to vote in the same way as their husbands, but it is far from sure that the influence runs all one way. Women are less party-bound than men; they abstain more often from voting; they are more likely to be influenced by personalities than are men, though, contrary to the general view, more women among those for whom there are statistics vote on the basis of platforms than of people.

Perhaps the most important conclusion drawn from M. Duverger's material is that, despite the hospitality of left-wing parties to women candidates, women voters tend to support the more conservative and religiously-oriented parties, like those of continental Christian Democracy. Particularly in France, this may be far from unimportant for the balance of parliamentary power. At least on one occasion—the defeat of the draft constitution of the Fourth Republic in the referendum of May 1948—the women's vote is thought to have been decisive.

One rather disturbing suggestion in M. Duverger's general conclusions is that there is an increasing tendency for women in politics to specialize on what are known as women's fields: health, housing, education, family welfare, etc. Thus in place of the earlier insistence on equality of citizenship, which was maintained so strongly in the fight for women's suffrage, there is a growing emphasis by political parties, and even by women's groups, on serving particular interests. The advantage may be that these very important interests will receive attention which they would otherwise lack; the danger is of an unnatural segmenting of life. Any over-sharp division between men and women, particularly in the field of political parties, could sacrifice individuality and personality to numbers and to an assumption of basic intellectual differences which has certainly not yet been proved. —GWENDOLEN M. CARTER, *Smith College.*

Public Enterprise: A Study of its Organisation and Management in Various Countries. EDITED BY A. H. HANSON. (Brussels: International Institute of Administrative Sciences. 1955. Pp. 530. $7.00.)

A useful selection of working papers prepared for the Seminar on the Organization and Administration of Public Enterprise in the Industrial Field, held in Rangoon in March, 1954, under the joint sponsorship of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the United Nations

Technical Assistance Administration, and the International Institute of Administrative Sciences. This does not purport to be a world survey of public enterprise; it is, rather, an unsystematic presentation of certain national experiences in public enterprise in several highly developed and less highly developed countries. There is great variety in the aspects of the subject chosen for discussion, there are many gaps, and the papers are uneven in quality. The collection, however, is interesting, informative, and stimulating; and the variety does not detract from its value.

The Colonial Office. By Sir Charles Jeffries. (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc. London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1956. Pp. 222. $2.40.)

This latest issue in the *New Whitehall Series* has been long needed and will prove invaluable to any student of the modern British empire. The author is now Deputy Under-Secretary in the Colonial Office; he thus writes with sympathy and authority, but he writes, too, with charm and objectivity. The book describes the organization of the office, the recruitment and management of its personnel, the problems confronted in various colonial territories and functional fields, and the general pattern of British colonial administration.

British Government Inspection as a Dynamic Process: The Local Services and the Central Departments. By John S. Harris. (New York: Frederick A. Praeger. 1955. Pp. xii, 196. $4.25.)

A careful study of inspection as a device by which the central government ministries ensure compliance by local bodies with central policies and standards. The author emphasizes the two-way function of the inspectorate, passing information and complaint to Whitehall as well as enforcing local conformity. Each functional area is examined, the techniques are described, and the effectiveness of the inspection process is evaluated. A very competent piece of work.

The People and the Constitution: Being a History of the Development of the People's Influence in British Government. By Cecil S. Emden. (2nd ed., rev. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press. 1956. Pp. vi, 339. $6.75.)

This new edition of a book first published in 1933—see this Review, XXVII (1933), 643 f.—has been "revised and brought up to date." It remains, however, useful chiefly as a co venient summary of the eighteenth-nineteent century development of the machinery popular influence and of the changing opinio of statesmen on the constitutional role of t people. Mr. Emden's treatment of more rece developments, his analyses of actual popul influence, and his ventures at normativ theory are too elementary to be of value t political scientists.

The British Commonwealth: An Experiment i Co-operation Among Nations. By Frank Underhill. (Durham: Duke Universit Press. 1956. Pp. xxiii, 127. $2.00.)

These three brief lectures by an eminen Canadian historian inaugurate a publicatio series by Duke University's new Commonwealth Studies Center. One hopes the serie will maintain this impressive standard of pe ceptiveness, urbanity, and charm. The autho offers an analysis of the historical developmen of the Commonwealth, an interpretation of it present structure, and a cautious prognosis o its future.

Divided We Stand: A Study of Partition. B Michael Sheehy. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1956. Pp. 104. $2.75.)

The author of this thin volume is a rarity a young Southern Irishman and sincere Roma Catholic who deplores the current efforts t end the partition of the island by forcin Ulster into the Republic of Eire. The arguments he makes in defense of partition (reasonably dispassionate in view of the controversy) embrace historical, sociological, an ethical considerations.

The Struggle for Responsible Government in th North-West Territories, 1870–97. By Lewi Herbert Thomas. (Toronto: Universit of Toronto Press. 1956. Pp. vii, 276. $5.00.)

A history of the various stages of territoria rule in western Canada, particularly in th areas now comprising Saskatchewan an Alberta. The book is divided into two sections, "The Establishment of the Territoria System" and "The Movement for Territoria Autonomy."

Trade Union Government and Administratio in Great Britain. By B. C. Roberts. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1956. Pp. vii, 570. $6.00.)

An extensive study of the government an administration of British trade unions. Th gal framework, the main structure of trade nion government, the electoral process, fficialdom, finance, and federal and T.U.C. rganization are considered successively. Some f the data are reassembled, union by union, in n appendix. The author is specially conerned with democratic organization and conrol. He concludes that "while the unions have acrificed democratic control for administraive efficiency as they have grown larger and ore centralized, there is evidence to show hat in the last resort the wishes of the memers are paramount." However, the location f power within the unions is not very sharply efined. Trade union policy and political ctivity, with the exception of political funds, re outside the scope of this study.

eturn to Power: A Report on the New Germany. By Alistair Horne. (New York: Frederick A. Praeger. 1956. Pp. 415. $7.00.)

A study of Germany, 1952–1955, by the ondon *Daily Telegraph's* correspondent at onn. The author emphasizes the struggle over ermany's relations to the EDC and NATO nd political and economic developments in Vest Germany; interesting observations are lso made about conditions in Russian-domated East Germany.

ie Neugliederung des Bundesgebietes: Gutachten des von der Bundesregierung eingesetzten Sachverständigenausschusses. Hrsg. vom Bundesministerium des Innern. (Bonn, Köln, Berlin; Carl Heymanns Verlag K.G. 1955. Pp. 221. 3 fold. maps. DM 12.00.)

A government committee to consider probems of the rearrangement of the territory of he *Länder* of the Federal Republic was apointed by the Government on January 15, 952, under the authority of art. 29 of the ederal Constitution. The chairman was ormer *Reichskanzler* Dr. Luther, who had ong been interested in the problem. The report s the result of a three-year study of the varius points involved and deals not only with he historical development of the areas but lso with various considerations affecting the bility of the *Länder* to function effectively.—J.B.C.)

ibliographischer Dienst Staat und Recht. Published by the Deutsches Institut für Rechtswissenschaft. Bi-monthly. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag GmbH. 1955–. DM 3.70 each number.)

For the current periodical literature in the fields of political science and law in the German Democratic Republic and in the People's Democracies, the highest official legal research agency of the DDR has been publishing since October, 1955, a bi-monthly classified bibliography. Included with this is a similar partial service for the journals of the German Federal Republic so far as received there, as well as an accessions-list of the library of the Institute, lists of translations into German from the Russian journal *Sovetskoe gosudarstvo i pravo*, and lists of unpublished translations into German available at the library of the Institute.—(J.B.C.)

250 questions, 250 answers, about the German Democratic Republic. By the Committee for German Unity. (Berlin: Verlag Die Wirtschaft. 1955. Pp. 184.)

The English language edition, translated from the 4th German edition, presents the case for the unification of Germany from the *official* point of view of the German Democratic Republic, in a series of questions and answers. The first German edition is dated January, 1954.—(J.B.C.)

Mouvements ouvriers et socialistes (chronologie et bibliographie): La Russie. Tome I, 1725–1907. By Eugène Zaleski. (Paris: Les Editions Ouvriers. 1956. Pp. 462.)

This is a bibliographical volume in a series dealing with the workers' movements in various countries, brought out under the auspices of *L'Institut Français d'Histoire Social.* The present work covers four areas: the infiltration of western ideas into Russia (1725–1850), the Populist Movement (1851–84), the emergence of the working-class and the birth of the Social Democratic Party (1885–1904), and the First Revolution (1905–1907). Volume Two, which is yet to appear, will carry the listings from 1907 to the present. The book is of special value to scholars not only because of its exhaustive listings, but also because of the inclusion under each work of a reference to the principal libraries in which it may be found.

Stalin's Great Secret. By Isaac Don Levine. (New York: Coward-McCann, Inc. 1956. Pp. 126. $2.50.)

Much expanded from an article in *Life* magazine, this book provides further evidence for the author's assertion that Stalin was an agent of the *Okhrana.* It will not be easy to confirm (or to refute) this well constructed case, which opens a new avenue to the understanding of a mysterious character.

The Balkans in Our Time. BY ROBERT LEE WOLFF. (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. xxi, 618. $8.00.)

A thorough study of Yugoslavia, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Albania since the beginning of World War II, with adequate background material to bring present-day Balkan problems into proper focus, by the wartime chief of the Balkan Section, Research and Analysis Branch, OSS, who is one of America's foremost Balkan experts. In detail, the author describes conditions in the Balkans before and during World War II, shows how the Communists came into power in all four countries, and describes political, social, and economic life in these countries since they fell into the Soviet orbit.

History of Turkey: From Empire to Republic. BY M. PHILIPS PRICE. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1956. Pp. 224. $4.50.)

Written by a British Member of Parliament and specialist on Near Eastern affairs, this brief history stresses the events leading to the rise of modern Turkey, the reforms of the Ataturk era, current political, social, and economic problems, and the role of Turkey in resisting Russian expansion.

Nationalism and Communism in East Asia. BY W. MACMAHON BALL. (New York: Cambridge University Press. 2nd ed., rev. 1956. Pp. v, 220. $5.15.)

A revised edition of a standard short wor by an Australian political scientist and goverr mental official. The relationship between na tionalism and communism is examined in th context of developments and trends in te Asian countries.

The Constitution of the Islamic Republic ‹ *Pakistan.* (Karachi: Department of Adve tising, Films and Publications. 1956. Pp xvii, 224.)

The Constitution of Pakistan, finall adopted and enacted by the Constituen Assembly on February 29, 1956, was publishe by the Ministry of Law in March, 1956. Th official edition of the text is unfortunately no indexed, and a rapid scanning of the table o contents does not furnish sufficient indicatio of many interesting features of the basic la of the first Islamic Republic.—(J.B.C.)

Policy Statement. ADOPTED BY THE SECON NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE PRAJ SOCIALIST PARTY HELD AT GAYA, 26–3 DECEMBER, 1955. (New Delhi: Praja Socialist Party. 1956. Pp. 99. Annas 12.)

The statement was prepared mainly by th late chairman of the Party, Acharya Narendr Deva, and "elucidates the Party's ideologica differences from individualism and communism, offers a brief criticism of the principle and policies of the Congress and the Communist Parties, and reviews in brief the objectives and claims of the Congress Government."—(J.B.C.)

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON

FOREIGN AND COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT

HIRAM M. STOUT

Washington, D. C.

General

Collin, P. V. Considérations sur le Recrutement et la Formation Professionnelle du Personnel de l'État. *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives.* No. 1, 1956.

Cooper, H. Political Preparedness for Self-Government. *The Annals.* July, 1956.

Domenach, J. M. Again the Popular Front. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Dretze, G. Constitutional Courts in Europe. *Dickinson Law Review.* June, 1956.

Ellis, H. S. The Financing of Economic Development in Underdeveloped Areas. *Indian Economic Journal.* January, 1956.

Gersh, G. Communism and Catholic Parties in Europe. *Social Science.* June, 1956.

Lowenthal, R. Three Roads to Power. *Problems of Communism.* July–August, 1956.

Schiller, O. Significance of the Soviet Agrarian System in Asian Countries. *Internationa Affairs.* July, 1956.

Tinker, I. and Walker, M. The First Genral Elections in India and Indonesia. *Far astern Survey*. July, 1956.

Tixier, G. Essai sur les Gouvernements ilitaires Contemporains. *Revue Politique et arlementaire*. June, 1956.

Specific Areas

nited Kingdom

Abel, D. The Whip in History. *Parliamenry Affairs*. Spring, 1956.

Britain's Defense Policy. *Labor and Industry n Britain*. June, 1956.

The British System of Taxation. Central ffice of Information. Reference Division. ondon, 1956.

Dunworth, J. V. Nuclear Power in Great ritain. *Journal of the Town Planning Institute*. ay, 1956.

Finer, S. E. In Defence of Pressure Groups. *he Listener*. June 7, 1956.

Gaitskell, H. Socialism and Nationalization. ondon, 1956. (Fabian Tract No. 300).

Gibbs, H. Britain's Defense Budget. *Air orce*. July, 1956.

Hanham, H. J. The Local Organization of he British Labour Party. *Western Political uarterly*. June, 1956.

Healey, D. Bulganin and Khrushchev in ritain. *Problems of Communism*. July–August, 956.

Jukes, J. A. Nuclear Energy: A Survey of Britain's Position. *International Affairs*. July, 956.

Kilmuir, Viscount. The Office of Lord hancellor. *Parliamentary Affairs*. Spring, 956.

Local Government. Areas and Status of Local Authorities in England and Wales. md. 9831. London, H.M.S.O., 1956.

Munby, D. The Procedure of Public Inuiries. *Public Administration*. Summer, 1956.

Our National Church. A symposium. *Naional and English Review*. June, 1956.

Potter, A. M. The English Conservative onstituency Association. *Western Political uarterly*. June, 1956.

Report of the Royal Commission on the ivil Service (1953–55). *Public Administraion*. Summer, 1956.

Smith, H. R. The Dispersal of Population rom Congested Urban Centres in Scotland. *Public Administration*. Summer, 1956.

Colonial Areas

Conference on British Caribbean Federation. Cmd. 9733. London, H.M.S.O., 1956.

Constitutional Progress in Mauritius. Central Office of Information. Reference Division. London, 1956.

Crist, R. E. Malta: Development Problems and Economic Prospects. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*. July, 1956.

Drake, S. Prospects for Democracy in the Gold Coast. *The Annals*. July, 1956.

Fawzi, S. The Transfer of Political Power. *Listener*. July 12, 1956.

Hannigan, J. J. The Impact of English Law upon the Existing Gold Coast Custom and the Possible Development of the Resulting System. *Journal of African Administration*. July, 1956.

Low, A. The British and the Baganda. *International Affairs*. July, 1956.

Progress Towards Full Self-Government in the Gold Coast. Central Office of Information. Reference Division. London, 1956.

Rosberg, C. G., jr. The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland: Problems of Democratic Government. *The Annals*. July, 1956.

Spector, S. Students and Politics in Singapore. *Far Eastern Survey*. May, 1956.

Tinker, I. Malayan Elections: Electoral Pattern for Plural Societies? *Western Political Quarterly*. June, 1956.

Tregonning, K. Malaya, 1955. *Australian Quarterly*. June, 1956.

West, F. J. Colonial Development in Central New Guinea. *Pacific Affairs*. June, 1956.

Commonwealth of Nations

Alexandrowicz-Alexander, C. H. American Influence on Constitutional Interpretation in India. *The American Journal of Comparative Law*. Winter, 1956.

Aschinger, F. E. Government and Enterprise in India. *Swiss Review of World Affairs*. July, 1956.

Aschinger, F. E. Socialism in India. *Swiss Review of World Affairs*. June, 1956.

Bakshi, P. M. Comparative Law: Separation of Powers in India. *American Bar Association Journal*. June, 1956.

Balaraman, K. The Indian Press and Foreign Policy. *Journal of International Affairs*. No. 2, 1956.

Ball, W. M. The Duties of a Member of Parliament. *Parliamentary Affairs*. Spring, 1956.

Balogh, T. The Plan under Scrutiny. *Banker*. July, 1956.

Barrett, R. H. Recent Domestic and International Politics in Australia. *Far Eastern Survey*. May, 1956.

Braden, G. D. Constitutional Law in India. Part II: Civil Liberties. *Connecticut Bar Journal.* March, 1956.

Brookes, E. H. South Africa's Problems; the Possibilities in an Impossible Situation. *African World.* June, 1956.

Campbell, P. The New Zealand Public Service Commission. *Public Administration.* Summer, 1956.

daCosta, E. P. W. India's New Five Year Plan. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Engelmann, F. C. Membership Participation in Policy-making in the C. C. F. *The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science.* May, 1956.

The Future of the Commonwealth. *The Round Table.* June, 1956.

Goode, R. Report of the India Taxation Enquiry Commission. *National Tax Journal.* June, 1956.

Gutteridge, W. F. The Commonwealth Conference. *Contemporary Review.* August, 1956.

Harrison, S. S. The Challenge to Indian Nationalism. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Jennings, I. Crown and Commonwealth in Asia. *International Affairs.* April, 1956.

Kingsbury, R. C. India's Industrial Growth. *Focus.* May, 1956.

Laskin, B. and others. Survey of Canadian Legislation. *University of Toronto Law Journal.* No. 2, 1956.

Low, H. R. Weapons of the Mind—For Canada's Armed Forces. *Queen's Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

MacKay, I. N. A Progress Report on Canadian Atomic Power. *Engineering Journal.* May, 1956.

McCarroll, D. New Zealand Taxes on Income. *Taxes.* July, 1956.

McInnis, E. *The Commonwealth Today.* Sackville, N. B., Canada, Mount Allison University, 1955. (Mount Allison University Publication No. 1.)

Meile, P. Les Élections de Ceylan. *Revue Française de Science Politique.* April–June, 1956.

Miller, B. The Commonwealth Conference in Perspective. *The Listener.* June 28, 1956.

Pakistan. *Constitution.* The Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. Karachi, Department of Advertising, Films and Publications, Government of Pakistan. 1956.

A "People's Government": Social and Political Trends in Ceylon. *World Today.* July, 1956.

Ramaswamy, M. Constitutional Developments in India, 1600–1955. *Stanford Universit Law Review.* May, 1956.

Simonds, G. Where We've Gone Wrong o Defense. *Maclean's.* June 23, 1956.

Skeet, T. H. H. India on the Move. *Banke* July, 1956.

Vile, M. J. C. Federalism and Labor Regulation in the United States and Australi *Political Science Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Weiner, M. India's Political Problems: Th Longer View. *The Western Political Quarterl* June, 1956.

Wentworth, W. C. Responsible Government in Australia: State Constitutions an Federal Power. *Australian Quarterly.* June 1956.

Western Europe

Bauer, R. Il Costume Burocratico. *Occident* No. 6, 1955.

Beloff, N. The Visionaries. *Occidente.* No. 6 1955.

Bondy, F. Young Spain and the Old Regime *Encounter.* July, 1956.

Bugard, J. Sécurité Sociale et Dirigeants d Sociétés. *Revue des Sociétés.* January–Februar –March, 1956.

Carey, J. P. C. Italy: Stable Instability *Foreign Policy Bulletin.* July 1, 1956.

Caxton, J. Falling Idols. *Commonweal* May 25, 1956.

Chastenet, J. Les Français; Sont-ils Patriotes? *Le Revue de Paris.* June, 1956.

Cocatre-Tilgien, A. Recours pour Excès d Pouvoir et Contrat dans la Jurisprudence d Conseil d'État Français. *Revue Internationa des Sciences Administratives.* No. 1, 1956.

Debré, M. Réflexions sur le Sentiment National dans la France d'aujourd'hui. *Occidente* No. 6, 1955.

Del Vayo, J. A. Split Down the Middle *Nation.* July 28, 1956.

Elfvengren, E. The Finnish Labour Force *International Labour Review.* April, 1956.

Fusilier, R. Le Statut du Personnel de Enterprises Nationalisées Comparé au Statu des Agents de la Fonction Publique. *Revu du Droit Public.* May–June, 1956.

Galli, G. The Italian CP. Part II: The Road Toward a Dilemma, 1945–56. *Problems o Communism.* May–June, 1956.

Harder, E. La Constitution danoise de 1953 *Revue Internationale des Sciences Administratives.* No. 1, 1956.

Katzenbach, E. L., jr. The French Army *Yale Review,* Summer, 1956.

Lamson, A. L'organisation de la Défense

'ationale et des Forces Armées. *Revue Poli- que et Parlementaire.* June, 1956.

L'Aménagement du Territoire: Problèmes olitiques et Administratifs. A symposium. *evue Française de Science Politique.* April- ıne, 1956.

Luethy, H. Poujade: Hitler or Pierrot? *ommentary.* April, 1956.

Nelson, L. Land Reform in Italy. National lanning Association. Washington, D. C. ugust, 1956.

Salvadori, M. A Look at Italian Democracy ı 1956. *International Journal.* Summer, 1956.

Solal-Celigney, J. La Question de Confiance. *'evue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique.* Iarch–April, 1956.

Sollie, F. Control over Public Administra- on in Norway. *Journal of Public Law.* Spring, 956.

Soubeyrol, J. Le Président de l'Assemblée [ationale. *Reveu du Droit Public.* May–June, 956.

Stjernschantz, G. Monetary Restriction in 'inland. *Banker.* July, 1956.

Veneziana, G. I Liceali Italiani e la Politica. *'ccidente.* No. 6, 1955.

Zariski, R. Problems and Prospects of)emocratic Socialism in France and Italy. *'ournal of Politics.* May, 1956.

Zartman, I. W. French Communist Foreign 'olicy, 1952–1954: A Propaganda Analysis. *'he Western Political Quarterly.* June, 1956.

'entral Europe

A Year After the Staatsvertrag in Austria. *Vorld Today.* July, 1956.

Beach, V. W. Germany: East or West?—)anger in the Making. *Queen's Quarterly.* pring, 1956.

Chapel, V. Le Droit Disciplinaire des 'onctionnaires Fédéraux dans la Republique 'édérale Allemande. *Revue Internationale des 'ciences Administratives.* No. 1, 1956.

Eszlary, C. L'organisation Administrative ıutrichienne. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* 'une, 1956.

Kadenbach, E. Zur bindenden Wirkung der Intscheidungen des Bundesverfassungsge- ichts. *Archiv. des Öffentlichen Rechts.* April, 956.

Kirchheimer, O. West German Trade Jnions. *World Politics.* July, 1956.

Kohn, H. The Problem of German Nation- ılism. *Contemporary Review.* May, 1956.

Mommsen, W. Deutsche Demokratic Ges- ern und Heute. *Politische Studien.* June, 1956.

Nemo, La "Démokratur" Allemande. *L'année Politique et Économique.* April–May, 1956.

Prittie, T. German Christian Democracy. *Occidente.* No. 6, 1955.

Soviet Union and Eastern Europe

Achminov, H. Social Conflicts at the Twentieth Party Congress. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R.* May, 1956.

After Stalin. A symposium. *Encounter.* June, 1956.

After the Twentieth Congress. *Monthly Review.* July–August, 1956.

Alexinsky, G. A. The Problem of Nationalities in the U.S.S.R. *East and West.* March, 1956.

Avtorkhanov, A. The Political Outlook after the Twentieth Party Congress. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R.* May, 1956.

Barth, J. Wieviel Menschen Kann Russisch-Asien Ernähren? *Osteuropa.* April, 1956.

Bedo, A. K. The Role of the Trade Unions in Communist Hungary. *Highlights of Current Legislation and Activities in Mid-Europe.* May, 1956.

Berg, V. New Changes in the Communist Party Regulations. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R.* June, 1956.

Bouscaren, A. T. Khrushchev and the Twentieth Congress. *Catholic World.* August, 1956.

The Case of Laszlo Rajk. *World Today.* June, 1956.

Chardonnet, J. Y a-t-il Depuis 1953 une Nouvelle Politique Économique Soviétique? *Revue de Défense Nationale.* June, 1956.

Czeckoslovakia: National Party Conference. *News from behind the Iron Curtain.* August, 1956.

Czechoslovakia: Short History of the Communist Party. *News from behind the Iron Curtain.* August, 1956.

Dallin, D. J. Whither Soviet Russia? *Sign.* June, 1956.

Draft of the New Law on State Pensions. *Current Digest of the Soviet Press.* June 20, 1956.

Dulles, A. W. The Soviet Concept of Legal Institutions. *Mercer Law Review.* Spring, 1956.

Eisele, L. W. Recent Developments in Soviet Education. *School and Society.* July 21, 1956.

Évolution Récente de la République Populaire Roumaine (1945–1955)—Première Partie: L'évolution Politique et le IIe Congress du

Parti Ouvrier Roumain. *Notes et Études Documentaires.* April 17, 1956.

Fainsod, M. The C.P.S.U. Takes Stock of Itself. *Problems of Communism.* May–June, 1956.

Gliksman, J. Recent Trends in Soviet Labor Policy. *Problems of Communism.* July–August, 1956.

The Great Pretense. A symposium on Anti-Stalinism and the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. Committee on Un-American Activities, U. S. House of Representatives. Washington, D. C. May 19, 1956.

Hargreaves, R. Heel of Achilles. *Military Review.* June, 1956.

Hayit, B. Die Turkestanischen Unionsrepubliken. *Osteuropa.* April, 1956.

Hibbs, R. S. Significance of the Volga-Don Canal. *United States Naval Institute Proceedings.* June, 1956.

Kardelj, E. Evolution in Jugoslavia. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Krivickas, D. The Evolution of the Soviet Constitution Imposed on Lithuania. *Baltic Review.* March, 1956.

Kucherov, S. The Soviet Union is not a Socialist Society. (In "Defense" of V. M. Molotov.) *Political Science Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Johnson, D. G. Observations on the Economy of the U.S.S.R. *Journal of Political Economy.* June, 1956.

Krushchev, N. S. Text of Speech on Stalin. *New York Times.* June 5, 1956.

L. L. Operation Lazarus. *World Today.* July, 1956.

Leading Positions and Personalities in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the U.S.S.R.* Supplement. May, 1956.

Lowenthal, R. Inventaire Soviétique. *Preuves.* May, 1956.

Meder, W. Die Hierarchie der Rechtsquellen in der Sowjetunion. *Osteuropa-Recht.* May, 1956.

Mehnert, K. Kolchose und Baumwolle in Usbekistan. *Osteuropa.* April, 1956.

Meissner, B. Die Ergebnisse des 20. Parteikongresses der Kommunistischen Partei der Sowjetunion (Erster Teil). *Europa Archiv.* May 5, 1956.

Mosley, P. E. Soviet Foreign Policy: New Goals or New Manners? *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Nosek, J. Czechoslovakia; Government Arbitration. *Highlights of Current Legislation an Activities in Mid-Europe.* May, 1956.

Pepper, N. Seeing Russia Straight. *Virgini Quarterly Review.* June 26, 1956.

Resolutions of the Twentieth Party Congress. *Current Digest of the Soviet Press.* Jun 20, 1956.

Rusis, A. Recent Changes in the Constitution of Soviet Latvia and Russification of th Latvian Government. *Highlights of Curren Legislation and Activities in Mid-Europe.* May 1956.

Seton-Watson, H. The Soviet Ruling Class *Problems of Communism.* May–June, 1956

Shulman, M. D. Is the Soviet Union Changing? *Problems of Communism.* May–June 1956.

Silone, I. and others. L'U.R.S.S., Demain *Preuves.* June, 1956.

Schlesinger, R. From the XIX to the XX Party Congress. *Soviet Studies.* July, 1956.

Souvarine, B. Le Stalinisme sans Stalins *La Revue de Paris.* June, 1956.

Ströhm, C. G. Jugoslawien und der XX. Parteitag. *Osteuropa.* April, 1956.

Tochitch, D. Les Conseils Ouvriers en Yougoslavie. *Revue d'Histoire Économique et Sociale.* No. 4, 1955.

Tokaiev, G. A. Stalin's Death and After. *East and West.* March, 1956.

Tucker, R. C. Stalin and the Uses of Psychology. *World Politics.* July, 1956.

Unpublished Documents Distributed among Delegates to Twentieth Congress of Soviet Communist Party. *Department of State Bulletin.* July 23, 1956.

Valkenier, E. The Catholic Church in Communist Poland. *Review of Politics.* July, 1956.

Voprosy Istorii Asks New Treatment of Party History. *Current Digest of the Soviet Press.* June 20, 1956.

Wolfe, B. D. Stalinism versus Stalin. *Commentary.* June, 1956.

Wolfe, B. D. Stalin's Ghost at the Party Congress. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Middle East and Africa

Adrian, D. The First Five Years of the Israel Civil Service. Studies in Economic and Social Sciences. The Hebrew University. Vol. III, 1956.

Akzin, B. Codification in a New State. A Case Study of Israel. *The American Journal of Comparative Law.* Winter, 1956.

Bagley, F. R. C. Egypt under Nasser. *International Journal.* Summer, 1956.

Codrai, R. Desert Sheikdoms of Arabia's

irate Coast. *National Geographic Magazine.* ly, 1956.

Comhaire, J. Some Aspects of Urbanization the Belgian Congo. *American Journal of ociology.* July, 1956.

Crowder, M. An Industrial Revolution in est Africa. *New Commonwealth.* June 11, 56.

Egypt. *Constitution.* The Egyptian Constitu- on. Cairo, Arab News Agency. 1956.

France in North Africa. *The Round Table.* ne, 1956.

Holt, P. M. Sudanese Nationalism and lf-Determination. Part I. *The Middle East ournal.* Summer, 1956.

The Independence of the Sudan. Central ffice of Information. Reference Division. ondon, 1956. (R. 3310.)

Iran. Central Office of Information. Refer- nce Division. London, 1956. (R. 3519.)

Knight, E. G. Education in French North frica. *Islamic Quarterly.* December, 1955.

Islam and Secularism in Turkey Today. *uarterly Review.* July, 1956.

Jandy, E. C. Ethiopia Today: A Review of s Changes and Problems. *The Annals.* July, 56.

Jones, C. F. The New Egyptian Constitu- on. *The Middle East Journal.* Summer, 1956.

Lewis, W. H. Ethiopia's Revised Constitu- on. *The Middle East Journal.* Spring, 1956.

Lewis, W. H. The Ethiopian Empire: Prog- ss and Problems. *The Middle East Journal.* mmer, 1956.

Livneh, E. Is Israel a Zionist State? *Mid- ream.* Summer, 1956.

Malik, C. Call to Action in the Near East. *oreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Maulnier, T. L'Afrique est à faire. *Preuves.* ay, 1956.

McCall, D. F. Ligeria: An Appraisal. *The nnals.* July, 1956.

McCally, S. P. Party Government in urkey. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1956.

Meyer, G. Le Problème Constitutionnel en gypte. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* June, 56.

Philip, D. The Real Drama of Algeria. *Con- mporary Review.* May, 1956.

Political Trends in the Fertile Crescent. *orld Today.* June, 1956.

Roshwald, M. Political Parties and Social lasses in Israel. *Social Research.* Summer, 56.

Samuel, E. A New Civil Service for Israel. *ublic Administration.* Summer, 1956.

Sfeir, G. N. The Abolition of Confessional Jurisdiction in Egypt. *The Middle East Journal.* Summer, 1956.

The Trust Territory of Somaliland Prepares for 1960. *United Nations Review.* August, 1956.

Tütsch. H. E. Report on Turkey. *Swiss Review of World Affairs.* August, 1956.

South and Southeast Asia

Armstrong, H. F. North of the Khyber. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Higgins, B. Indonesia's Development Plans and Problems. *Pacific Affairs.* June, 1956.

Political Progress in Nepal. *World Today.* June, 1956.

Stephens, I. Nepal between Two Worlds. *The Listener.* May 31, 1956.

Pacific and Far East

Ballis, W. B. The Political Evolution of a Soviet Satellite: The Mongolian People's Republic. *Western Political Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Dore, R. P. Japanese Election Candidates in 1955. *Pacific Affairs.* June, 1956.

Hellenthal, W. Der Tennō. *Politische Studien.* July, 1956.

Houn, F. W. *and* Yuan-li W. Chinese Communist Publication Policy and Thought Control. *Pacific Spectator.* Summer, 1956.

Jones, F. E. Justice in Modern China. *Listener.* July 19, 1956.

Knauss, B. Die Demokratie in Japan in Spiegel der Zeitschriftenliteratur. *Politische Studien.* July, 1956.

Mendel, D. H., jr. Ozaki Yukio: Political Conscience of Modern Japan. *The Far Eastern Quarterly.* May, 1956.

Murakami, S. *and* Bunkichi, I. Postwar Reconstruction of Japanese Education and its Social Aspects. *Journal of Educational Sociology.* March, 1956.

Nagato, M. New Party Alignment and Political Stability. *Contemporary Japan.* Nos. 1–3.

Ohe, S. The Socio-Political Experiment in Postwar Japan. *Ethics.* July, 1956.

Schwarz, U. Domestic Politics in Japan. *Swiss Review of World Affairs.* June, 1956.

Sohier, A. En Chine: l'Église Catholique sous le Régime Communiste. *Vie Intellectuelle.* July, 1956.

Soodruff, J. S. The Japanese Lawyer. *Nebraska Law Review.* March, 1956.

Strope, W. E. On Japanese Naval Rearmament. *United States Naval Institute Proceedings.* June, 1956.

Thomas, S. B. Communist China's Agrarian

Policy, 1954–56. *Pacific Affairs.* June, 1956.

Wittfogel, K. A. Forced Labor in Communist China. *Problems of Communism.* July–August, 1956.

Latin America

An Old Civilization Stirs up Political Problems. *Business Week.* June 9, 1956.

Ballon, E. Z. Sickness Insurance in Latin America. *Bulletin of the International Social Security Association.* April, 1956.

Fitzgibbon, R. H. How Democratic is Latin America? *Inter-America Economic Affairs.* Spring, 1956.

Fitzgibbon, R. H. Revolutions: Western Hemisphere. *South Atlantic Quarterly.* July, 1956.

Lipson, L. Government in Contemporar Brazil. *The Canadian Journal of Economi and Political Science.* May, 1956.

Mendes, M. A., jr. O Sistema de Carreira o Princípio da Profissionalização. *Revista d Serviço Público.* November, 1955.

Pendle, G. Revolution in Argentina. *Inte national Affairs.* April, 1956.

Sayagues Laso, E. Les Établissements Pub lico Économiques en Uruguay. *Revue Inte nationale des Sciences Administratives.* No. 1956.

Verengo, R. Freedom of Association an Industrial Relations in Latin America: Part *International Labour Review.* May, 1956.

Verengo, R. Freedom of Association an Industrial Relations in Latin America: Par II. *International Labour Review.* June, 195

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

Europe's Classical Balance of Power: A Case History of the Theory and Practice of One of the Great Concepts of European Statecraft. BY EDWARD VOSE GULICK. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1955. Pp. xvii, 337. $5.50.)

The ceaseless struggle for influence is an abiding characteristic of human relations with which every society must contend. The great variety of ways in which the problem has been dealt with provide the fascinating, and frequently fantastic, material of political history. Not the least interesting exhibit is that afforded by eighteenth-century Europe, whose outlook and particular set of practices culminated in the Congress of Vienna. It is a period set off by the religious controversies that preceded and the nationalistic conflicts that followed it. Characterized by rationalism, scepticism, and moderation, it produced its own brand of politics. Balance of power was its ideal, much as, Gulick remarks, democracy is the twentieth-century ideal.

Balance of power is one of those loose terms in which political science abounds. Yet in the eighteenth-century context it had a certain precision. More than merely a peripheral concept, it was a philosophy of politics which the practicing diplomats sought earnestly to apply. Gulick is admirably successful in describing the system. He first constructs a theoretical model based on the writings of the time, and secondly he shows, in an extended account of the Congress of Vienna, the profound influence of the concept on statesmen of tha period. He gives a lucid explanation of a phenomenon that students of international relations only too often are content to treat i generalities. The book abounds in pertinen quotations and contains a critical bibliograph of value.

Gulick's final judgment concerning balanc of power is clearly formulated. It cannot b fully set forth here, for his conclusion is unavoidably complex. But it is interesting tha he distinguishes balance of power from a Machiavellian policy. He also makes this interesting point: "Woodrow Wilson, who di much to discredit the balance of power an popularize the idea of the League of Nations conceived the two to be antipodal, the one t rest on an unstable balance between opposin factions and the other to lodge on the secur foundation of a preponderance of power. A examination of the history of equilibri theory, however, indicates that his conceptio was seriously wrong in this respect." This reviewer has found that an internal examinatio of Wilson's policy points to the same confusion. Gulick suggests that the source of th difficulty is failure to distinguish betwee what he calls "alliance balance" and "coalition equilibrium," the latter being an outgrowth of the former. Indeed, he contend that collective security "must be regarded a the logical end point of the balance-of-powe system."—EDWARD H. BUEHRIG, *Indian University.*

reaties and Federal Constitutions. By James McLeod Hendry. (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press. 1956. Pp. v, 186. $4.50.)

That a study of this subject should be made a Canadian professor of law, trained both Canada and in the United States, is alto- ther commendable. In addition to that of e two federal governments under which he as lived, Professor Hendry analyzes the ex- rience of Switzerland and Australia. In art I of his book he presents a background scription of the historical and constitutional pects of treaty-making in the four federa- ons. Capacity to enter into treaties and per- rmance ability under them are compared in art II and Part III respectively. In Part IV e author offers opinions and suggestions in- nded to solve or to simplify some of the oblems earlier clarified.

The extent to which federations are handi- pped in treaty matters is the main theme of rofessor Hendry's investigation, and on this bject he makes a number of well-supported neralizations. For instance, he points out e more clear-cut and definite arrangement executive power in the United States and witzerland, as compared with Australia and anada. The treaty powers of the central vernment of the United States, both in spect to "capacity" and "performance," he lieves adequate to the expanding need for eaties in world affairs. Examining judicial oinions, he finds state laws no bar to treaties aling with proper subjects for international gulation; he nevertheless considers the enth Amendment a "deterrent to a too ex- ansive interpretation of treaty clauses." e might well have explained an actual, if ot legal, handicap in treaty-making in this ountry resulting from executive fear of arges that treaties are being used to amend e Constitution, should it sign United Na- ons treaties dealing with human rights: our overnment has opposed a covenant of human ghts, and more recently it has rejected a ewly negotiated convention against slavery. anada, the author argues, is handicapped hen agreements require legislative action utside the orbit of Section 91 of the Consti- tion because the prior approval of the rovinces must be obtained.

Professor Hendry contends that treaties unicipally inoperative and unenforceable re nevertheless valid in international law, hether they be violative of the "capacity" mitations or the "performance" limitations of the constitution. His well-constructed argument might be strengthened by reference to the practice of the United States of conceding its international responsibility and granting financial redress when one of the forty-eight states has been delinquent in protecting aliens and has thus rendered inoperative a treaty to which this nation is a party.

Professor Hendry is critical of federations for their weaknesses in treaty matters. In his opinion, the growing need for agreements on economic and social matters raises a question as to whether the federal form of government can endure. Switzerland and the United States have, he believes, experienced more of a trend toward the centralization which modern conditions demand than have Australia and Canada.

The reader will find in this volume a well-documented and well-reasoned treatment of the subject. Americans will discover little about their governmental system that is new but will profit from a thoughtful comparison of our methods and problems with those of other countries.—Norman Hill, *University of Nebraska.*

The German Fifth Column in the Second World War. By Louis De Jong. Translated from the Dutch by C. M. Geyl. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Pp. xi, 308. $5.00.)

This valuable study of an important subject was written for the State Institute for War Documentation in Amsterdam, by its Executive Director. He believes the book bears "a provisional character" (pp. vii–viii) because he did not have access to all sources—hardly possible under the circumstances. However, he has dug up sufficient evidence to make his points convincingly.

In Part I the author graphically describes the "Fear" of the German civilian and military Fifth Column which developed in many countries after 1933, often growing into veritable panics. The alarm caught on in the United States and in the Americas, with the help of reports from reputable statesmen and established reporters, until there was a "Fixed Image" (Chapter VIII). Nor has the story changed in post-war writings. Only "a few [historians have] expressed any clear doubts of the omnipotence of the Fifth Column" (p. 139).

Part II of the book, entitled "Reality," tells what actually happened, in Europe and in America. The author concludes his careful examination by stating: "There is a striking difference between the ideas about the German Fifth Column . . . and the actual activities . . . in almost all countries the size of the German military Fifth Column was grossly overestimated." Evidence of its activities "of any considerable magnitude [was] confined to Poland and Yugoslavia" (pp. 246, 266).

However, the "German political Fifth Column certainly was no myth." Hitler wielded this weapon with consummate mastery. The *Anschluss* and the annexation of the Sudetenland "were the two greatest, the two only important successes really that Hitler was able to achieve by manipulating mass movements in foreign parts." Much as the notions that sprang up during 1933–39 "may have been exaggerated or incorrect as to particulars . . . in many respects the actual events were even worse . . ." (pp. 289, 295–96). For various reasons, however, political Fifth Columns developed only in Memel, Hungary, Roumania, Poland, and Yugoslavia. In some countries such developments were not feasible; in others they did not fit in with Hitler's plans, as in Estonia, Latvia, and the South Tyrol (p. 294).

In a chapter called "Historical Summary," the author describes the activities abroad of the functionaries of the various Nazi party organizations, the Gestapo, Foreign Office, and the Army intelligence (as he points out, the latter two institutions of all countries were engaged in similar activities). He also treats with great clarity the various factors favoring the rise of Fifth Column activities among *volksdeutsche* groups outside Germany.

The book is carefully indexed and documented. The author points out that its Dutch edition contains "a 35-page survey of all source materials used as well as an introduction to these sources" (p. 301). It is a pity that the Chicago University Press did not see its way clear to include them and thus make the book even more valuable.

We might add that a jacket for a scholarly publication should be written with more regard for the actual contents and conclusions of the book than was done in this case.—John Brown Mason, *Georgetown University.*

World Indivisible: With Liberty and Justice for All. By Konrad Adenauer. Translated by Richard and Clara Winston. (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers. 1955. Pp. xxx, 128. $2.75.)

The fifth volume of *World Perspectives,* planned and edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen, consists of selections from speeches by Germ Chancellor Konrad Adenauer that portr him as a consistent advocate of "World I divisible: With Liberty and Justice for All He asserts that "narrow-minded nationalisn was the root of Germany's disaster and th the age of national states has come to an en He has favored an integrated Europe as t nucleus of an alliance among those politic forces whose basis is Christianity; such union is seen as a deterrent to the further a vance of Soviet Russia, which he characteriz as "Christianity's deadliest and most territ enemy." He is hopeful that some day t U.S.S.R. will negotiate with the United We and that an honorable *modus vivendi* may established. "Once the immediate crisis h been overcome and becomes a thing of tl past, the new-formed community of the We will continue as a living example of practic neighborly union, at first only in the We but with time, possibly, in the whole world

In his introduction, Professor Ernest Jacl makes it clear that consistency in person conduct and political philosophy as a featu of Konrad Adenauer's character is not limit to his period as Chancellor but has bee evident in his entire public career.

An explanatory note states that these sele tions from the Chancellor's speeches are co cerned with three distinct periods extendi from the founding of the Federal Republic September, 1949, to the return of Germa sovereignty in May, 1955. Unfortunatel however, the speeches are neither dated n identified. They are presented in essential chronological order in fifteen chapters wi such headings as "End of Nationalism "Christian Civilization at Stake," "Worldwi Aggression by Totalitarian Communism "Germany's Reunification," and so on.

This collection will not be useful for tl historian who is interested in discovering wh the Chancellor said on specific occasions, b it is of great value for anyone interested obtaining a portrait of the political thought "the best German statesman since Bismarck. —Charles D. Hounshell, *Emory Universit*

Argentine Upheaval: Perón's Fall and the Ne Regime. By Arthur P. Whitaker. (Ne York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc. 195 Pp. x, 179. $3.50.)

This little volume, as Professor Whitak would doubtless be the first to admit, is piece of reporting and analysis (and a mo competent one) rather than one of researc some respects it is unfortunate to have it me out in book form, and yet we could have t it, in the detail that it gives, in no other y. The official terminal date of the study December 1, 1955 (the author in one footnote ounts a development of as late as December) and yet the inevitable delays of book nufacturing prevented publication before end of May, 1956. Professor Whitaker was ed, in exaggerated form, with the dilemma newspaper correspondent would be con- nted with if he knew that his very timely patch would not be published for, say, two eks.

And yet, granting that unescapable sort of kwardness in the timing of the study, the thor has done an uncommonly good job of t only lucidly recounting the factual de- lopments in the critical and dramatic Ar- ntine picture of the last half of 1955, but o in analyzing and interpreting the impacts d attitudes of classes, power groups, and rties.

One might quarrel mildly with some of the tails of the interpretation, as for instance regard to the future role of the very young tholic parties, but that does not deny the ential validity of the way in which the thor has read between the lines. It is at st startling, too, to read the ultra-realistic ggestion that "if the United States wishes strengthen the present regime in Buenos res, it could do worse than stir up a sharp lomatic controversy with the authorities ere" and then subsequently eat humble pie d perhaps make a large loan in pseudo- ntrition, thus enabling nationalistic Argen- a to gain a presumptive diplomatic triumph. would indeed be a novel technique if pro- ted into the general conduct of United ates foreign relations!

The utility of the volume is increased by the dition of translations of some ten key oadcasts emanating from Buenos Aires at tical points in the late 1955 scene. All in all, e study is a highly useful one to add to the gentine shelf.—Russell H. Fitzgibbon, *iversity of California* (*Los Angeles*).

e United Nations and Human Rights. By James Frederick Green. (Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution. 1956. Pp. viii, 194. $1.50.)

This paperback volume is Part I of a pro- ted book on *The United Nations and Promo- n of the General Welfare;* it is published in advance of the full work (one of seven in the Brookings series on the United Nations) "because of . . . current public interest." The author comprehensively surveys U. N. experience in defining, promoting, and protecting human rights; the treatment begins logically with a deft sketch of the historical setting and concludes with a summary examination of efforts to deal with violations of these rights. Green writes competently and with meticulous care as to details of procedure, albeit with a fervor for condensation that excludes much of the "human interest." As appendices appear the texts of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and of the two International Draft Covenants, one on Civil and Political Rights and the other on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. As a most reliable reference work and an aid to research, this partial study will serve well.

The general reader will be impressed with the vast scope of the subject, with the sustained idealism and pioneering character of myriad diverse enterprises to make headway in this vital field through organized international action, and with the grave difficulties that retard, if not seriously impeach the wisdom of, the cause. For the underlying philosophical premise—that, while maintaining world peace is the primary objective, the long-run success of the U. N. requires substantial progress in achieving justice among peoples and nations—pervades the whole effort, as it undoubtedly will the complete book on the U. N. and the general welfare. The validity of this premise is a lesson as yet only imperfectly learned by the American people, as the reversal of national policy on the Draft Covenants demonstrates. The author's account makes surpassingly clear how such high purpose has been obscured and its pursuit frustrated by the interplay of the politics of national interest with the diverse cross purposes of the East-West cold war, colonialism *versus* dependent peoples, developed countries *versus* the underdeveloped, and white races *versus* the colored. Miracle it is that anything has been accomplished; but Green vouches that it has, however tentative and piecemeal.—August O. Spain, *Texas Christian University.*

Survey of International Affairs, 1953. By Peter Calvocoressi. (Oxford, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1956. Pp. vii, 400. $7.70.)

Documents on International Affairs, 1953. EDITED BY DENISE FOLLIOT. (Oxford, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1956. Pp. xix, 513. $9.20.)

Felicitous in style, judicious in the selection of materials, straightforward in opinion, Mr. Calvocoressi and his collaborators manage again to cover a great many events in a relatively slender volume. Continuing the policy of emphasizing now one area or country, now another, they provide for 1953 a rather detailed account of France and, for the first time since the *Survey* for 1947–8, a separate section, written by George Pendle, on Latin America. In both cases, there is considerable emphasis on internal political and economic conditions. Mr. Pendle, in addition, takes up the threat of communism within the Latin American states, carrying the story of Guatemala down to the events of June, 1954. F. C. Jones contributes the sections covering the Far East. This is the last of the surveys for which Mr. Calvocoressi will have responsibility, a fact that one must note with regret. The volume of documents, as usual in the postwar series, parallels the *Survey* in its organization.

The Anglo-American Tradition in Foreign Affairs: Readings from Thomas More to Woodrow Wilson. EDITED BY ARNOLD WOLFERS AND LAURENCE W. MARTIN. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1956. Pp. xxvii, 286. $4.50.)

Containing selections from twenty English and American philosophers and officials of the past four centuries, the present volume demonstrates that the historical study of political thought has relevance for international as well as for domestic politics and problems. The editors have chosen well. Their selections convey the fundamental propositions made by each man, an understanding of why he reacted as he did to the problems of his time, and something of the flavor of his personality as well. Taken together, the readings present some recurring problems and patterns of thought, some common threads forming, perhaps, an Anglo-American tradition in foreign affairs, and a good many points of contact with Continental thought besides. Continuity is provided by the running commentaries of the editors, and the whole is introduc by Professor Wolfers.

Sbornik deistvui͡ushchikh dogovorov, soglashen i konvent͡sii zakli͡uchennikh SSSR s in strанny mi gosudarstvami. Vypusk XI PUBLISHED BY THE SOVIET MINISTRY (FOREIGN RELATIONS. (Moscow: Gosudars vennoe Izdatelstvo Politicheskoĭ Liter tury. 1956. Pp. 198.)

The twelfth volume of the Soviet offici treaty collection covers the period from Se tember, 1945, through the end of 1946, ar includes only the texts in Russian. For Mo golia and certain other countries, treaty tex do not seem to be normally available exce in this Russian collection.—(J.B.C.)

The Communist International: 1919–1943 Do uments. Vol. I: 1919–1922. SELECTED AN EDITED BY JANE DEGRAS. (Oxford, Ne York, Toronto: Oxford University Pres 1956. Pp. xvi, 463. $8.80.)

A valuable collection of documents illustr tive of the policies, pronouncements, ar organizational problems of the Communi International from 1919–1943. A second vo ume is planned, continuing the story up to th dissolution of the Third International. Th work will be welcomed as a handy and author tative reference by scholars working in th field of Communism and Russian History.

Annuaire Européen. European yearbook. Vo II. PUBLISHED UNDER THE AUSPICES O THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE. (The Hagu M. Nijhoff. 1956. Pp. xix, 727.)

Several present-day European organizatio are treated for the first time in Vol. II. Amon these may be mentioned the Central Commi sion for the Navigation of the Rhine, Benelu Balkan Alliance, International Commission o Civil Status, Customs Co-operation Counci European Plant Protection Organization, an the Conference on the Coordination of A Transport in Europe. Information and doc ments about most of these are obtainable onl with much difficulty. Also included in th volume are articles on American and Russia attitudes towards European integration.– (J.B.C.)

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON
INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

WILLIAM H. ROBERTS
Catholic University of America

ARTICLES

International Politics and National Policies

General

Berger, E. M. Antarktis-Landnahme und Erforschung. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik.* August, 1956.

Berlitzer, H. Hunger und Aussenpolitik. *Aussenpolitik.* July, 1956.

Deshpande, N. R. Peaceful Co-existence. *Indian Journal of Political Science.* January–March, 1956.

de Zavala Castella, J. Geopolitics—its Present Value. *Military Affairs.* August, 1956.

Emeny, B. Mainsprings of World Politics. New York, Foreign Policy Association, 1956. (Headline Series No. 118).

Giscard d'Estaing, E. Communisme et Nationalisme. *Revue de Paris.* January, 1956.

Hans, N. Exportation of Educational Ideas. *Journal of Educational Sociology.* March, 1956.

Lifton, R. J. "Thought Reform" of Western Civilians in Chinese Communist Prisons. *Psychiatry.* May, 1956.

Mackenroth, G. Weltbevölkerung und Weltwirtschaft. *Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft.* No. 1, 1956.

Maroger, J. L'Évolution de l'Idée de Supranationalité. *Politique Étrangère.* No. 3, 1956.

Preston, R. A. Nationalism in the Atomic Age. *International Journal.* Summer, 1956.

The Problems of the Nuclear Period. *Confluence.* April, 1956.

Rudin, H. R. Diplomacy, Democracy, Security: Two Centuries in Contrast. *Political Science Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Salvatorelli, L. La Nuova Fase della Politica Internazionale. *Communità Internazionale.* January, 1956.

Schein, E. H. The Chinese Indoctrination Program for Prisoners of War: a Study of Attempted "Brainwashing." *Psychiatry.* May, 1956.

Sencourt, R. New Trends in Diplomacy. *Quarterly Review.* July, 1956.

Shaffer, H. B. Educational Exchange. *Educational Research Reports.* July 11, 1956.

Struye, P. La Vie Internationale. *Revue Politique.* March, 1956.

Timmler, M. Der Wettlauf um die Unterentwickelten Gebiete. *Internationales Jahrbuch der Politik.* January, 1956.

U. S. Library of Congress. General Reference and Bibliography Division. A Guide to Bibliographic Tools for Research in Foreign Affairs. Washington, 1956.

Waples, D. Publicity versus Diplomacy: Notes on the Reporting of the "Summit" Conferences. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

Military and Functional Questions

Amery, J. The World Distribution of Military Power. *East and West.* March, 1956.

Bericht zur Atomaren Lage. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik.* June, 1956.

Bogardus, E. S. Social Implications of Atomic Energy. *Sociology and Social Research.* February, 1956.

Buzzard, A. The Crux of Defence Policy. *International Relations.* April, 1956.

Hodgson, P. E. The International Control of Atomic Energy. *Atomic Scientists Journal.* March, 1956.

Inglis, D. National Security with the Arms Race Limited. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.* June, 1956.

Kaempffert, W. The Many Uses of the Atom. New York, Foreign Policy Association, 1956. (Headline Series, No. 117.)

Koch, N. Revolution des Wehrdenkens. *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik.* May, 1956.

Leghorn, R. S. Controlling the Nuclear Threat in the Second Atomic Decade. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.* June, 1956.

Moch, J. L'État Actuel des Négociations sur le Désarmement. *Cahiers Français.* March, 1956.

Mountbatten, L. Allied Naval and Air Commands in the Mediterranean. *Military Review.* June, 1956.

L'Organizzazione delle Nuove Forze Armate. *Relazioni Internazionali.* April 14, 1956.

Pergent, J. Les Principales Conceptions Stratégiques "Atomiques." *Revue de Défense Nationale.* March, 1956.

Von Studnitz, H. G. Die Luft ist nicht Frei. *Aussenpolitik.* July, 1956.

United States

Allen, G. V. United States Foreign Policy in Africa. *Annals.* July, 1956.

Armstrong, H. F. North of the Khyber. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Bowie, R. B. United States Foreign Economic Policy. *Department of State Bulletin.* July 23, 1956.

Dean, V. M. American Policy on European Integration. *European Yearbook,* 1954.

Une Étude Critique de la Politique Étrangère Américaine. *Articles et Documents.* January 12, 1956.

Kennan, G. F. Weiter als Koexistenz. *Aussenpolitik.* August, 1956.

Knorr, K. E. Euratom and American Policy; a Conference Report. Princeton, Center of International Studies, 1956.

Malenbaum, W. U. S. Economic Policy in South and Southeast Asia. *India Quarterly.* April–June, 1956.

Martin, C. The Soft War. *Western Political Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Nitze, P. H. The Modern President as a World Figure. *Annals.* September, 1956.

Peeters, P. Aux États-Unis: la Politique Étrangère des États-Unis et la Stratégie Atomique. *Revue Nouvelle.* May 15, 1956.

Stokes, J. M. The International Cooperation Administration. *World Affairs.* Summer, 1956.

Trivers, H. Morality and Foreign Affairs. *Virginia Quarterly Review.* June, 1956.

Van Alstyne, R. W. Myth versus Reality in the Far Eastern Policies of the United States. *International Affairs.* July, 1956.

Wit, D. The United States and Japanese Atomic Power Development. *World Politics.* July, 1956.

Wriston, H. M. The Secretary of State Abroad. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Young, K. T., Jr. The Challenge of Asia to United States Policy. *Department of State Bulletin.* August 27, 1956.

Canada

Joynt, C. B. Canadian Dilemma. *World Affairs Quarterly.* July, 1956.

McInnes, E. Canadian Opinion and Foreign Policy. *Queen's Quarterly.* Winter, 1956.

Pearson, L. B. Some Aspects of Canadian-American Relations. *External Affairs.* May, 1956.

Taylor, A. Canada and Competitive Coexistence; Our Role in the UN. *Queen's Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

Latin America

L.B.T. La Actividad Internacional e Hispanoamérica durante el Año 1955. *Cuader nos de Política Internacional.* October–De cember, 1955.

Salazar, J. L. C. The New Communis Economic Offensive in Latin America. *Vita Speeches.* August 1, 1956.

Technical Cooperation in Latin America—Recommendations for the Future. Washing ton, National Planning Association, 1956.

Wyckoff, T. The Strategic Location o South America. *Military Review.* July, 1956.

United Kingdom

Great Britain. Central Office of Information Reference Division. Anglo-Iraqui Relations 1918–1956. London, 1956.

———. ———. ———. Britain and Middl East Development. London, 1956.

Jukes, S. A. Nuclear Energy: A Survey o Britain's Position. *International Affairs.* July 1556

Meyer, F. V. The Commonwealth anc Europe: Britain's Dilemma. *Political Quarterly.* April–June, 1956.

Neilson, F. England and the Balance o Power. *American Journal of Economics anc Sociology.* July, 1956.

New Tests of Anglo-American Alliance. *Statist.* April 7, 1956.

Younger, K. La France et la Grande Bretagne devant les Problèmes Européens. *Politique Étrangère.* No. 3, 1956.

Western Europe

Chastenet, J. L'Union Française et son Destin. *Revue de Paris.* March, 1956.

Devinat, P. Un Renouveau Franco-Vietnamien est-il Possible? *Politique Étrangère.* No. 4, 1956.

Dix Ans après Hitler: la France a-t-elle Pardonné? *Réalités.* July, 1956.

Eriksen, E. La Quatrième Session du Conseil Nordique. *Bulletin Interparlementaire.* 2nd trim., 1956.

Günther, H. K. Dänemark und die Verteidigung Westeuropas. *Wehr-Wissenschaftliche Rundschau.* May, 1956.

Lange, H. La Norvège dans les Rapports Internationaux. *Revue de la Politique Internationale.* March 16, 1956.

Lapie, P. O. Politique Coloniale et Politique Étrangère. *Revue des Deux Mondes.* May 1, 1956.

Petrén, G. Scandinavian Cooperation. *European Yearbook,* 1954.

La Politique Étrangère de la France. *Perspectives.* March 17, 1956.

Vernant, J. La France et la Coopération Atomique Européene. *Revue de Défense Nationale.* April, 1956.

Zartman, I. W. French Communist Foreign Policy, 1952–1954: a Propaganda Analysis. *Western Political Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Central Europe

Adenauer, K. La République Fédérale et l'Intégration Européene. *Documentation Française.* April 3, 1956.

L'Armée Allemande de l'Est. *Documents.* February–March, 1956.

Les Aspects Économiques du Réarmement Allemand. *Chronique de Politique Étrangère.* November, 1955.

Le Direttive di Politica Estera di Adenauer. *Relazioni Internazionali.* March 31, 1956.

Documents sur le Problème Militaire en Allemagne Orientale. *Notes et Études Documentaires.* October 27, 1955.

Erler, F. La Politique Extérieure de la République Fédérale. *Politique Étrangère.* No. 4, 1956.

Friedrich, O. A. Aussenpolitik mit Wirtschaftlichem Boden. *Aussenpolitik.* June, 1956.

Das Militärische Kriegspotential Westdeutschlands. *Dokumente der Zeit.* February, 1956.

Morel, P. L'Allemagen Face à l'Euratom. *Documents.* February–March, 1956.

Scheuner, U. Die Frage der Wiedervereinigung nach den Genfer und Londoner Gesprächen. *Aussenpolitik.* June, 1956.

Schmitt, M. Grundfragen der Künftigen Aussenhandelspolitik. *Volkswirt.* March 17, March 24, April 14, April 21, 1956.

Younger, K. Neue Weltpolitische Perspektiven. *Aussenpolitik.* July, 1956.

Southern Europe and Mediterranean

Dimitri, C. S. Greek Foreign Policy. *Revue de Droit International (Sotille-Genéve).* April–June, 1956.

L'Espagne et le Projet de Pacte Méditerranéen. *Perspectives.* May 12, 1956.

Great Britain. Central Office of Information. Reference Division. The Black Sea Straits. London, 1956.

L'Italia nell'O.N.U. *Rivista di Studi Politici Internazionali.* January–March, 1956.

La Jugoslavia e l'Attuale Momento Internazionale. *Relazioni Internazionali.* March 12, 1956.

Katona, P. The Détente between Yugoslavia and her Neighbours. *International Relations.* April, 1956.

Lazar, H. J. Spanien und der Aufbruch des Islams. *Aussenpolitik.* June, 1956.

Nincic, D. The Balkan Pacts. *European Yearbook,* 1954.

Salazar conto l'Unità Europea & Gli Obiettivi Internazionali di Salazar. *Relazioni Internazionali.* February 4, 1956.

Soviet Union and Eastern Europe

Apremont, B. La Pénétration des Pays du Bloc Soviétique au Moyen-Orient et dans le Sud-Est Asiatique. *Politique Étrangère.* April, 1956.

Bechtoldt, H. Von Molotow zu Schepilow. *Aussenpolitik.* August, 1956.

Beck, L. N. Soviet Military Literature and Soviet Air Doctrine. *Air University Quarterly Review.* Spring, 1956.

Beloff, M. The Russian View of European Integration. *European Yearbook,* 1954.

Dallin, A. Red Star on Military Affairs, 1945–1952. Santa Monica, Rand Corp., 1956.

Galay, N. La Percée Soviétique au Moyen-Orient et en Asie Méridionale.*Documentation Française.* April 28, 1956.

———. New Trends in Soviet Military Doctrine. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the USSR.* June, 1956.

———. The New Reduction in the Soviet Armed Forces. *Bulletin of the Institute for the Study of the USSR.* July, 1956.

Garder, E. L'Armée Soviétique. *Revue de Défense Nationale.* November, 1955.

Glaser, W. A. Theories of Soviet Foreign Policy: a Classification of the Literature. *World Affairs Quarterly.* July, 1956.

Le Gouvernement Soviétique Lie le Problème du Désarmement au Développement des Échanges Est-Ouest. *Bilans Politiques, Économiques et Sociaux Hebdomadaires.* April 5, 1956.

Hogan, W. C. The Spirit of Geneva. *United States Naval Institute Proceedings.* August, 1956.

Horatius. Strategy of the Arctic Zone. *East and West.* March, 1956.

Kecskemeti, P. The Soviet Approach to International Political Communication. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

London, I. Evolution of the U.S.S.R.'s Policy in the Middle East, 1950–1956. *Middle Eastern Affairs.* May, 1956.

Long, J. F. L. Russia's Oil. *Air Power.* April, 1956.

Meissner, B. Die Ergebnisse des 20. Parteikongresses der Kommunistischen Partei der Sowjetunion (2). *Europa Archiv.* May 20, 1956.

Mosely, P. E. Soviet Foreign Policy: New Goals or New Manners? *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Nesterow, M. Sowjetunion für Erweiterung des Westhandels. *Volkswirt.* March 31, 1956.

Les Relations entre l'U.R.S.S. et l'Asie. *Notes et Études Documentaires.* February 28, 1956.

Rubio García, L. Un Arma Soviética de la "Guerra Fría": La Offensiva Comercial. *Cuadernos de Política Internacional.* October–December, 1955.

The Soviet Bloc and Under-developed Countries. *World Today.* June, 1956.

Taylor, J. W. R. How Good is the Soviet Air Force? *Air Power.* April, 1956.

Toma, P. A. Soviet Attitude towards the Acquisition of Territorial Sovereignty in the Antarctic. *American Journal of International Law.* July, 1956.

Voir, J. K. The Soviet General Staff Takes Stock. *World Today.* November, 1955.

Wandycz, P. S. The Soviet System of Alliances in East Central Europe. *Journal of Central European Affairs.* July, 1956.

Weltrevolution durch Koexistenz. *Ost-Probleme.* November, 1955.

Whiting, K. R. The Search for a Soviet Air Doctrine. *Air University Quarterly Review.* Spring, 1956.

Middle East and Africa

Atyeo, H. C. Arab Politics and Pacts. *Current History.* June, 1956.

The Baghdad Pact. *British Survey.* April, 1956.

Giraud, E. Les Aspects Internationaux de la Question Algérienne. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* July, 1956.

Hirsch, A. M. From the Indus to the Jordan: Characteristics of Middle East International River Disputes. *Political Science Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Kelly, J. B. The Buraimi Oasis Dispute. *International Affairs.* July, 1956.

Khan, Z. Islam and International Relations. *Internationale Spectator.* June 8, 1956.

Knauss, B. Der Vorstoss der Sowjetunion in den Mittleren Osten. *Politische Studien.* August, 1956.

Lewis, B. The Middle Eastern Reaction to Soviet Pressures. *Middle East Journal.* Spring, 1956.

Longrigg, S. Oil in the Middle East. *Current History.* June, 1956.

Malik, C. Call to Action in the Near East. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Marchand, J. Stratégie et Psychologie en Afrique Noire. *Revue de Défense Nationale.* February, 1956.

———. Les Puissances Anticolonialistes et l'Afrique Noire Française. *Revue de Défense Nationale.* May, 1956.

Price, P. Tensions in the Middle East. *Royal Central Asian Journal.* April, 1956.

Rétif, A. Le Marxisme en Afrique Noire. *Études.* January, 1956.

Rudin, H. R. The International Position of Africa Today. *Annals.* July, 1956.

Sharp, W. R. The United Nations System in Egypt: a Country Survey of Field Operations. *International Organization.* May, 1956.

Silvain, R. Le Moyen-Orient Entre dans la Guerre Froide. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* May, 1956.

Torres, M. C. Panorama Diplomático de Africa. *Cuadernos Africanos y Orientales.* 1st trim., 1956.

Troutbeck, J. Britain in the Middle East. *Current History.* June, 1956.

Vernant, J. Vers une Nouvelle Stratégie Diplomatique au Proche-Orient? *Revue de Défense Nationale.* March, 1956.

Via Suez. *Economist.* August 4, 1956.

Woodhouse, C. M. Cyprus and the Middle Eastern Crisis. *International Journal.* Winter, 1955–56.

South and Southeast Asia

Asian Studies in Undergraduate and Teacher Education. New York, Conference on Asian Affairs, 1955.

Chowdhury, H. H. Pakistan's Foreign Policy. Karachi, 1956.

Fisher, C. A. Crisis in Southeast Asia. *Queen's Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

Ghosal, A. K. Panch Shila. *Indian Journal of Political Science.* January-March, 1956.

Haqqui, S. A. H. Some Reflections on India's Foreign Policy. *Indian Journal of Political Science.* January–March, 1956.

India and Pakistan. *Economist.* June 9, 1956.

Lawrence, D. Where is Indonesia Going? *Foreign Policy Bulletin.* June 15, 1956.

Nehru Riafferma il Principio della Coesistenza. *Relazioni Internazionali.* April 7, 1956.

Pakistan and her Neighbours. *Round Table.* June, 1956.

Sing, S. C. America, India and the Commonwealth. *Indian Journal of Political Science.* January–March, 1956.

Wint, G. Last Transfers in Asia. *Twentieth Century.* March, 1956.

Zinkin, T. Indien in der Welt. *Aussenpolitik.* June, 1956.

Far East and Pacific

Crankshaw, E. China and Russia. *Atlantic Monthly.* June, 1956.

The Far East in the Free World. Symposium. *Current History.* July, 1956.

Seidensticker, E. G. Thoughts on Anti-American Sentiment in Japan. *Japan Quarterly.* April–June, 1956.

Smythe, H. H. Japan and China. *Phylon.* 4th trim., 1955.

Soviet Political Strategy in Asia. *World Today.* May, 1956.

Tyler, A. L. Anti-Americanism in the Philippines. *Pacific Spectator.* Summer, 1956.

U. S. Information Agency. "Contiguous Territory"—An Important Historic Principle of Soviet-Communist Revolution in East Asia. Washington, 1956.

International Economic Policy and Relations

Biclet, Y. L'Union Européene des Paiements. *European Yearbook,* 1954.

Biedenkopf, K. H. Massenproduktion, Wettbewerb und Europäische Vereinigung. *Europa Archiv.* June 5, 1956.

Brandt, K. La Stratégie Économique du Développement Agricole. *Revue d'Économie Politique.* January–February, 1956.

La Dixième Session du G.A.T.T. *Bulletin du Conseil National du Patronat Français.* March, 1956.

Donner, O. Die Weltbank und Deutschland. *Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft.* No. 1, 1956.

Economic Activity in Africa. *United Nations Review.* August, 1956.

L'Espansione Economica Europea e i Suoi Problemi. *Mondo Economico.* March, 1956.

Hammarskjold, D. For a New Approach to International Aid and Technical Assistance. *United Nations Review.* July, 1956.

Heilbronner, R. L. This Growing World. Economic Development and the World Bank. New York, Public Affairs Committee, 1956. (Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 237.)

Köllner, L. Die Bedeutung der Notenbanken für eine Gemeinsame Europäische Wirtschaftspolitik. *Europa Archiv.* June 20, 1956.

Lombardo, I. M. L'Azione Internazionale per l'Aumento della Produttività. *Mondo Aperto.* February, 1956.

Morgenstern, W. Der "Europäische Kongress der Arbeit" in Paris. *Europa Archiv.* June 5, 1956.

The Post-War Economic Record. *United Nations Review.* August, 1956.

Snapp, R. B. International Business Aspects of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. *Texas Law Review.* June, 1956.

Stein, G. Il Ritmo degli Investimenti nell'Europa Occidentale. *Mercurio.* March 31, 1956.

———. Investimenti (e Consumi) nel Blocco Sovietico. *Mercurio.* April 7, 1956.

Stone, W. T. Trading with Communists. *Editorial Research Reports.* July 25, 1956.

Weghorn, E. Die 11. Plenarsitzung der ECE. *Europa Archiv.* June 5, 1956.

Wyndham White, E. Les Obstacles à la Libération des Échanges Internationaux. *Aussenwirtschaft.* June, 1956.

International Law

Bartos, M. Codification du Droit Diplomatique. *Revue de la Politique Internationale.* February 15, 1956.

Bindschedler, R. L. Die Neutralität im Modernen Völkerrecht. *Zeitschrift für Ausländisches Öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht.* June, 1956.

Bishop, W. W., Jr. International Law Commission Draft on Fisheries. *American Journal of International Law.* July, 1956.

Blix, H. The Rule of Unaminity in the Revision of Treaties: a Study of Treaties Governing Tangier. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* July, 1956.

Canyes, M. Transformación Jurídica del Sistema Interamericano en el Trienio de 1945 a 1948. *Inter-American Juridical Yearbook,* 1952–54.

De Visscher, C. Reflections on the Present Prospects of International Adjudication. *American Journal of International Law.* July, 1956.

Fioravanzo, G. Le Droit de Guerre est-il Mort? *Revue de Défense Nationale.* February, 1956.

Friedmann, W. Some Impacts of Social Organization on International Law. *American Journal of International Law.* July, 1956.

Glaser, S. Elément Moral de l'Infraction Internationale. *Revue Générale de Droit International Public.* October–December, 1955.

Hayton, R. D. The "American" Antarctic.

American Journal of International Law. July, 1956.

Korowicz, M. St. The Problem of the International Personality of Individuals. *American Journal of International Law.* July, 1956.

Lauterpacht, E. The Contemporary Practice of the United Kingdom in the Field of International Law—Survey and Comment. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly.* July, 1956.

Mid-South Regional Conference on International Law and Foreign Trade: Papers and Other Proceedings. *Louisiana Law Review.* June, 1956.

Münch, F. Tätigkeit der Vereinten Nationen in Völkerrechtlichen Fragen. *Archiv des Völkerrechts.* July, 1956.

Northey, J. F. Constitutional Limitations as Affecting the Validity of Treaties. *University of Toronto Law Journal.* No. 2, 1956.

Notes on Current Inter-American Developments. *Inter-American Juridical Yearbook,* 1952–54.

Oda, S. The Hydrogen Bomb Tests and International Law. *Friedens-Warte.* No. 2, 1956.

Orfield, L. B. Jurisdiction of Foreign Courts over Crimes Committed Abroad by American Military Personnel. *South Carolina Law Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

Phleger, H. United States Treaties: Recent Developments. *Department of State Bulletin.* July 2, 1956.

Rudolf, W. Informationsfreiheit und Rundfunk im Völkerrecht. *Jahrbuch für Internationales Recht.* Nos. 2–3, 1954.

Schätzel, W. Die Theorie des Krieges bei Francisco de Victoria und der Moderne Angriffskrieg. *Acta Scandinavica Juris Gentium.* No. 4, 1955.

Walther, H. Le Statut International de la Navigation du Rhin. *European Yearbook,* 1954.

Wright, Q. The Prevention of Aggression. *American Journal of International Law.* July, 1956.

International Organization

United Nations and Specialized Agencies

Bartos, M. L'O.N.U. et la Coopération Régionale. *Revue de la Politique Internationale.* February 1, 1956.

Bastid, S. Le Rôle de l'Europe aux Nations-Unies jusqu'à la Dixième Session de l'Assemblée Générale. *Revue Générale de Droit International Public.* October–December, 1955.

Brügel, J. W. Der Konflikt zwischen Völkerrecht und Rassenpolitik. Südafrika und die Vereinten Nationen. *Europa Archiv.* July 20, 1956.

La Coopération Atomique Pacifique. *Notes et Études Documentaires.* March 20, 1956.

Cottrell, W. F. The United Nations and Africa. *Annals.* July, 1956.

Determined Efforts to Seek Agreement on Disarmament. *United Nations Review.* July, 1956.

Disarmament—Continued Narrowing of Differences Sought. *United Nations Review.* August, 1956.

Frye, W. R. Press Coverage of the UN. *International Organization.* May, 1956.

García Arias, L. El Problema Político de la Admision de Nuevos Miembros en la O.N.U. *Política Internacional.* July–September, 1955.

Gross, E. A. Major Problems in Disarmament. *Northwestern University Law Review.* July–August, 1956.

Mr. Hammerskjold's Continuing Good Offices in the Middle East—The Security Council's Unanimous Decision. *United Nations Review.* July, 1956.

Pollard, H. M. Die Völkerrechtskommission der Vereinten Nationen. *Europa Archiv.* July 5, 1956.

La Question Palestienne devant les Nations Unies, 1945–1955. *Revue de Droit International pour le Moyen-Orient.* December, 1955.

Richardson, L. M. The Legal Relation between an International Organization and its Personnel. *Wayne University Law Review.* Spring, 1956.

Roling, B. V. A. Some Observations on the Review of the Charter. *India Quarterly.* January–March, 1956.

Sebastian de Erice, J. Las Naciones Unidas y el Ingreso de Nuevos Miembros. *Cuadernos de Política Internacional.* October–December, 1955.

Striking Rise in Technical Aid: Progress Reviewed in Survey of Operations for 1955. *United Nations Review.* August, 1956.

Vers la Création de l'Agence Atomique Internationale. *Revue des Nations Unies.* February, 1956.

Wehberg, H. Der Gegenwärtige Stand der Internationalen Organisation. *Universitas.* March, 1956.

Wilcox, F. O. The United Nations and the Search for Disarmament. *Department of State Bulletin.* July 16, 1956.

egional and Collective Security Organizations

Accioly, H. A. ONU e os Organismos Re- onais. *Inter-American Juridical Yearbook,* 952–1954.

Armand, L. Atomic Energy and the Future Europe. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

La Bataille de l'Euratom. *Bilans Heb- omadaires.* January 26, 1956.

Benoist, J. L'Union de l'Europe Occidentale. *evue Générale de Droit International Public.* ctober–December, 1955.

Bonnefous, E. Les Impératifs d'une Relance tlantique. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* pril, 1956.

Carlier, M. J. Communes et Organisations ommunales devant la Construction Euro- éenne. *Cahiers de Bruges.* April, 1956.

Le Conseil de l'Europe 1951–1956. *Chronique Politique Étrangère.* May, 1956.

Cuevas Cancino, F. El Problema de las elaciones entre un Organismo Regional y el undial. *Inter-American Juridical Yearbook,* 952–1954.

Erven, L. Le Pacte de Bagdad. *Revue de la olitique Internationale.* February 15, 1956.

Friedmann, W. New Tasks for NATO? *nternational Journal.* Summer, 1956.

Greppi, E. A Propos du Caractère de la .E.C.A. *Cahiers de Bruges.* April, 1956.

Hayoul, M. L'Europe Atomique. *Revue ouvelle.* May 15, 1956.

Heilperin, M. A. Europe Edges toward a ommon Market. *Fortune.* September, 1956.

Heintz, F. J. The Baghdad Pact. *Duquesne eview.* Spring, 1956.

Heywood, M. Der Colombo Plan. *Europa rchiv.* July 5, 1956.

Huet, P. Les Problèmes Financiers et les éthodes de L'Alliance Atlantique. *Europa rchiv.* June 5, 1956.

Kitcheev, G. O.T.A.N. et Sécurité Collec- ve. *Politique Étrangère.* April, 1956.

Lavergne, B. L'Escroquerie de l'Euratom, ouvelle C.E.D. ou M. Jean Monnet Aspirant u Pouvoir Absolu en Europe Occidentale. *nnée Politique et Économique.* January– arch, 1956.

Little, T. R. The Arab League: a Reassess- ent. *Middle East Journal.* Spring, 1956.

N.A.T.O. at the Crossroads: Disengagement the Cold War. *Round Table.* June, 1956.

L'VIII Sessione del Consiglio d'Europa— efiniti i Principi Politici Europei. *Relazioni nternazionali.* April 28, 1956.

Organisation de l'Union de l'Europe Oc- dentale. *Notes et Études Documentaires.* arch 1, 1956.

Oriente e Occidente all'Assemblea di Strasburgo. *Relazioni Internazionali.* April 28, 1956.

Le Plan de Colombo: Historique et Premières Années d'Application. *Problèmes Économiques.* April 3, 1956.

Ramos Galino, F. Actividades y Perspectivas del Consejo de Europa. *Cuadernos de Política Internacional.* October–December, 1955.

Remige, A. Politique Européene de l'Énergie Atomique. *Revue Nouvelle.* May 15, 1956.

Robertson, A. H. The Creation of Western European Union. *European Yearbook,* 1954.

Schröder-Brzosniowsky, I. Der Stand der Wirtschaftlichen Integration Europas im Frühjahr 1956. *Gewerkschaftliche Monatshefte.* April, 1956.

Speckaert, G. P. La Formation et le Perfectionnement des Fonctionnaires Européens. *Associations Internationales.* March, 1956.

Steindorf, E. Literatur zur Entwicklung der Europäischen Gemeinschaft für Kohle und Stahl. *Europa Archiv.* June 20, 1956.

Vernant, J. L'O.T.A.N. Cherche son Avenir. *Revue de Défense Nationale.* June, 1956.

Wingenroth, C. G. SEATO: Lösung von Gestern? *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik.* May, 1956.

DOCUMENTS

General and Miscellaneous

Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War. August 12, 1949. *American Journal of International Law.* July, 1956.

Great Britain. Foreign Office. Vietnam and the Geneva Agreements. Documents Concerning the Discussions between Representatives of Her Majesty's Government and the Government of the U.S.S.R. held in London in April and May, 1956. London, H.M.O., 1956.

ILO. Social Aspects of European Economic Co-operation. Geneva, 1956.

WHO. Proposed Programme and Budget Estimates for the Financial Year 1 January–31 December 1957. Geneva, December 1955.

United Nations

All entries under this heading bear the imprint of the United Nations (New York), 1956, unless a different place or date is shown.

Disarmament Commission. Third Report of the Sub-Committee of the . . . (Doc. DC/83; May 4, 1956).

ECOSOC. ECE. The Commission's Programme of Work for 1956/1957 (Doc. E/ECE /236; February 29, 1956).

———. ECLA. Brief Review of the Work and Activities of the Commission, 1948–1955 (Doc. E/CN.12/AC.34/2/add.1; April 11, 1956).

International Law Commission. International Responsibility. Report (Doc. A/CN.4/96; January 20, 1956).

———. Questions Relating to the Law of the Sea. Report (Doc. A/CN.4/97; January 27, 1956).

———. Codification of the International Law Relating to Diplomatic Intercourse and Immunities. Memorandum Prepared by the Secretariat (Doc. A/CN.4/98; February 21, 1956).

———. Comments by Governments on the Provisional Articles Concerning the Regime of the High Seas and the Draft Articles on the Regime of the Territorial Sea Adopted by . . . at its Seventh Session (Doc. A/CN.4/99; March 12, 1956).

———. Report on the Law of Treaties (Doc. A/CN.4/101; March 14, 1956).

Secretary-General. Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards. Report by . . . (Doc. E/2822; January 31, 1956).

———. Report of . . . to the Security Council Pursuant to the Council's Resolution of 4 April 1956 on the Palestine Question (Doc. S/3596; May 9, 1956).

———. Summary Statement by . . . on Matters of which the Security Council is Seized (Doc. S/3618; July 16, 1956).

United States

Unless otherwise indicated, all entries under this heading bear the imprint: "Washington: Government Printing Office."

Congress

House. Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Foreign Service. Basic Information on Organization, Administration and Personnel. 84th Cong., 1st sess.

———. ———. Draft Bills Amending the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948. Hearings. March 6 . . . 15, 1956. 84th Cong., 2nd sess.

———. ———. Mutual Security Act of 1956. Hearings. March 20 . . . May 10, 1956. 84th Cong., 2nd sess.

———. ———. Foreign Affairs Advisory Board. Hearings before Subcommittee. June 22, 1956. 84th Cong., 2nd sess.

———. ———. Foreign Service Act Amendments. Hearings. June 27–29, 1956.

———. ———. Foreign Service Act Amendments of 1956. Report. H. Rep. 2696. 84t Cong., 2nd sess.

———. ———. Survey of Activities—February 5, 1955–July 27, 1956. 84th Cong. 2nd sess.

———. ———. Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements. International Organizations and Movements Hearings. February 20 . . . July 4, 1956 84th Cong., 2nd sess.

———. ———. Subcommittee on the Nea East and Africa. Report of the Special Stud Mission to Africa, South and East of th Sahara. 84th Cong., 2nd sess.

———. Committee on Un-American Activities. The Communist Conspiracy; Strateg and Tactics of World Communism—Part I Communism Outside the United States—Section B: The U.S.S.R. (H. Rep. 2241); Sectio C: The World Congresses of the Communis International (H. Rep. 2242); Section D Communist Activities Around the World (H Rep. 2243); Section E: The Comintern an the CPUSA (H. Rep. 2244). 84th Cong., 2n sess.

———. Committee on Ways and Means Organization for Trade Cooperation. Hearings. 84th Cong., 2nd sess.

Senate. Committee on Appropriations Financing of Aswan High Dam in Egypt Hearing. January 26, 1956. 84th Cong., 2n sess.

———. Committee on Foreign Relations Technical Assistance and Related Programs Report. S. Rep. 1956. 84th Cong., 2nd sess.

———. ———. Providing for a Study of th Possibility and Desirability of Establishing University of the Americas. Report. S. Rep 2671. 84th Cong., 2nd sess.

———. ———. Subcommittee on Disarmament. Control and Reduction of Armaments Second Interim Report. S. Rep. 2829. 84t Cong., 2nd sess.

———. ———. ———. Control and Reduction of Armaments. Hearings. Part 8—June 8 1956. 84th Cong., 2nd sess.

———. ———. ———. Control and Reduction of Armaments. A Decade of Negotiations, 1946–1956. Staff Study No. 3. 84t Cong., 2nd sess.

———. ———. Subcommittee on Technical Assistance Programs. Soviet Technica Assistance. Staff Study No. 7. 84th Cong. 2nd sess.

———. Committee on Government Operaions. Subcommittee on Investigations. East-Vest Trade. Hearings. 3 pts. 84th Cong., 2nd ess.

———. ———. ———. East-West Trade. eport. S. Rep. 2621. 84th Cong., 2nd sess.

———. ———. ———. Communist Interogation, Indoctrination and Exploitation of merican Military and Civilian Prisoners. earings. June 19 . . . 27, 1956. 84th Cong. nd sess.

———. Committee on the Judiciary. Subommittee to Investigate the Administration f the Internal Security Act. Scope of Soviet ctivity in the United States. Hearing. Part —March 6, 1956.

Executive Departments

Department of the Army. Communist Interrogation, Indoctrination and Exploitation of Prisoners of War (Pamphlet No. 30–101).

Department of State. U. S. Participation in the UN. Report by the President to the Congress for the Year 1955 (Pub. No. 6318).

———. Swords into Plowshares (Pub. No. 6344).

———. Circular No. 175, December 13, 1955: Proper Exercise of the Treaty-Making Power of the United States (*American Journal of International Law.* July, 1956).

———. International Cooperation Administration. Mutual Security Legislation and Related Documents.

POLITICAL THEORY, RESEARCH, AND METHODOLOGY

ames Wilson: Founding Father, 1742–1798. By CHARLES PAGE SMITH. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1956. Pp. xii, 426. $7.50.)

It is odd that James Wilson has had to ait more than a century and a half for adeuate biographical treatment. A signer of the eclaration of Independence, a key politician n both Pennsylvania and the Continental ongress, one of the two or three vital figures n the Constitutional Convention, a legal heorist and Justice of the Supreme Court—uch a man would seemingly have merited xtensive eulogy by the ancestor collectors ho dominated American historiography hroughout most of the nineteenth century. is dubious financial enterprises and incredible areer as a land speculator might even have arned him a place in the rogues' gallery of the ebunkers. Yet Professor Smith has had a lear field, and one can risk the guess that his xhaustive labors have made it unlikely that he task will need doing again.

James Wilson is a fine book, written by a iterate scholar who is obviously thoroughly at ome in the period. Wilson was an extraorinarily complex person and lived in an age hich defies simple analysis, but at long last he as received his due at the hands of a pereptive student of both. Smith has managed to eld the various facets of Wilson's personality nto a coherent pattern and in so doing has suplied the reader with a crystal window onto the ife of the time.

Professor Smith suggests that the reason or the long delay in memorializing Wilson was the essentially off-beat character of this dour, brilliant Scot. "Jimmy de Caledonia," as the Pennsylvania anti-Federalists scornfully dubbed him, simply refused to be jammed into anyone's conceptual bed of Procrustes. The nationalist historians considered him a skeleton in the Federalist closet—a Founding Father and Supreme Court Justice who died in pathetic and ignominious flight from his creditors. The populist interpreters were likewise stymied: how could they fit into the aristocratic Federalist stereotype a man who advocated direct popular election of both the President and the Senate?

The book is particularly valuable on the strictly political activities of this extremely active, if not hyper-active, party stalwart. In contrast—and this is my only significant criticism of the work—the sections dealing with Wilson's legal and metaphysical efforts read as though they had been written in fits of absent-minded boredom. Chapters XXI and XXII, "The Nature of Law" and "Law and Society," are notable offenders on this score, and it is a tribute to the overall style of the biography that the reader finds himself shocked by the sudden deterioration. But despite all the incantations about "Scottish Realism" which Smith inserts, Wilson was, in my view, primarily a man of action, a fast, acute pragmatic reasoner. It is surely true that his Common Sense metaphysic supplied him with foundations for action that differed from those of, say, Hamilton or Jefferson, but I think this difference can be exaggerated, and certainly he was in his worst form when he wandered into the rarefied realm of abstraction. Professor Smith has vividly recreated James Wilson, Man of Action; it seems probable to me that no one could blow real life into James Wilson, Abstract Thinker.—JOHN P. ROCHE, *Brandeis University.*

Energy and Society: The Relation Between Energy, Social Change and Economic Development. BY FRED COTTRELL. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc. 1956. Pp. xix, 330. $6.00.)

One of the great gaps in current political science literature and research involves the relationships of the physical sciences and technology to political values and processes. Whether this lacuna in knowledge is due to overspecialization in political science, to fears of concepts of scientific determinism, or to some other factors, not enough attention is being given to the social consequences of the physical aspects of man's living environment. Unfortunately, therefore, this pioneering volume which deals with perhaps the most basic of all physical processes, namely, energy, will not receive the study and recognition which it deserves by our profession.

In brief, this book is an examination of the impact of the growth and use of energy upon an evolving civilization and institutions. Its major thesis is that the extent to which man employs and converts the various forms of energy conditions the types of social and political organizations which are established. The transition from a low-energy-using society to a high-energy-using society is not inevitable, though, given the various circumstances under which energy is employed, it is possible to predict the kind of social arrangements which will be developed. The three major factors limiting any nation's energy-using capacity are deemed to be (1) natural resources and mechanical limitations, (2) excessive population pressures, and (3) non-responsive customs and ideologies.

What are the implications of increasing use of energy for a nation's political structure? In general, the author sees an enlargement and concentration of political power, an expansion of state functions together with the loss of local autonomy, greater controls over systems of production and distribution, more emphasis upon public administration, and shifts in the processes of political decision-making. On an international basis, he predicts that high-energy technology will produce regional systems or alliances rather than the single international state since the former can mor readily take advantage of energy developmen opportunities.

There are bound to be many rough spots an omissions in a work such as this, which break so much new ground and is so interdisciplinar in scope. This reviewer, for example, though that the significance of coal *vis-à-vis* fissionabl fuels is overplayed or, as another illustration that too much weight is given to problem associated with the industrialization of agriculture in contemporary society. Also, in number of instances the social and politica aspects of physical processes were not full developed. However, these are subordinat considerations when viewed within the context of the overall design of this volume. Wha is important is that political scientists be encouraged to comprehend the basic significanc of this study, since technological trends indicate that increasingly in the future it will b upon works such as these that a meaningfu system of political analysis will be built.—ERNEST A. ENGELBERT, *University of California (Los Angeles).*

The Growth of Papal Government in the Middl Ages: A Study in the Ideological Relation of Clerical to Lay Power. BY WALTE ULLMANN. (New York: Barnes and Noble Inc. 1956. Pp. xviii, 482. $8.00.)

In 1949 Dr. Walter Ullmann publishe *Medieval Papalism: The Political Theories o the Medieval Canonists,* in which he constructe the thesis that the medieval canonists wer primarily responsible for the growth of "th theory of political omnipotence of the Pope a Boniface VIII propounded it in Unam Sanctam." In the volume now under review, Dr Ullmann purports to trace the developmen of "papal-hierocratic" doctrine from the fourt century to its maturity prior to the canonists juristic formulation of it in the mid-twelft century. Both volumes give abundant evidenc of the author's vast erudition and of his scholarly dedication to the recovery of the meanin and significance of medieval ideas and event as they were mutually related. The virtues o both volumes are unhappily marred by defective methodology and a rigorist interpretation which seeks out a "unity of themes an a consistency of principles" in a period o medieval history when in fact there were n systematic, definitive, and precise statement of the ideological relations of clerical to la power.

Dr. Ullmann posits at the start that govern-ent achieves for society its proper end hrough the instrumentality of those functionally qualified. When, therefore, in the edieval period, roughly between Emperor ratian and the Bolognese Monk Gratian, the tate was neither actual nor even conceived s in the Graeco-Roman *politeia* or in the ristotelian-Thomistic speculation, the nature nd purpose of the Church, unchallenged, arked society with its supreme goal, eternal ife, and, in accordance with its teleological rinciple, subordinated all exercise of temporal ower to this singleness of purpose. Dr. Ullann sees a vertical and coherent development from the premises of the Petrine commision and the vicariate of Christ, as with nevitable logic the implications of these divine mpowerments are brought forth by the elasian conception of the superiority and niversality of the spiritual power; by the sidorian conception of the auxiliary role of he Christian prince for the implementation of hristian justice, as interpreted by the acerdotally qualified; by the annexation of the Roman conception of *principatus* to the *edes apostolica;* by the juristic involvements f the fabricated Donation of Constantine; nd by the symbolism of substantive doctrinal ontent of the coronation ceremonies. All hese themes conduce to the subordination of he *regia potestas,* wholly devoid of any utonomy, to the *auctoritas papalis.*

The architectonic structure of this dialectic s its very weakness. It rests upon some rather azardous scaffoldings. The author presumes hat expressions and premises of general eference were understood, and intended for pplication in the settlement of particular onflicting claims, in precisely the same sense nd broad application as he understands hem; and that the instances in which the role f the medieval ruler was judged by the cclesiastics to be subordinate and auxiliary to the sacramental and magisterial jurisdiction of the Church provided exhaustive definitions of the entire purpose of temporal governance. Moreover, that the distinction of function, though subordinate, might not as well have argued for a temporal autonomy with purposes broader than those supposed by the author is a consideration not to be too lightly dispensed with. Finally, his reconstruction of fragmentary testimonies of claims and counterclaims, resolving an *ad hoc* conflict into systematic, coherent ideologies of papalist and imperialist positions, is more likely a modern projection into the past than medieval events speaking for themselves. A. M. Stickler has put forth six directives for the discernment of the meaning of the decretalists which, I think, may rather profitably be heeded in the study of the pre-canonists ("*Sacerdotium et Regnum nel decretisti e primi decretalisti: considerazioni metodologiche di ricerca e testi,*" *Salesianum,* XV, 1953, 572–612).

Dr. Ullmann has made a major contribution to medieval studies, not only because of his vast learning and dedicated purpose but more because his scholarship is directed to the establishment of theses that are at variance with those more commonly held. His present work will surely call for a re-examination of interpretations and a re-appraisal of the texts that were vibrantly part of the complex events of medieval Christendom. It may well be that his theses will not prevail, for want of a sound methodology.—JOSEPH F. COSTANZO, S. J., *Fordham University.*

Studies in Hindu Political Thought and Its Metaphysical Foundations. BY VISHWANATH PRASAD VARMA. (Banaras: Motilal Banarsidass. 1954? Pp. ii, 218. Rs 15/–.)

There is very little political thought in India in the Western sense of the term. Indian political theory is an integral part of the totality of Hindu philosophy. Man's principal goal in life, according to Hindu philosophy, is to achieve Moksha (freedom) from worldly bonds and toil by following the dictates of Dharma (supreme law). The State is considered to be the handiwork of Dharma and thereby serves as a means toward the realization of Moksha. Thus in the political scheme of things it is spiritual aspirations that predominate.

However, in an apparent effort to match Hindu traditions with those of the West, many Indian scholars seem to have overlooked these factors in assessing the importance of their political heritage. As a consequence, Indian scholarship in political theory has, with few exceptions, suffered from one or more of these defects: reading Western concepts into ancient Hindu texts; using Anglo-Saxon nomenclature to discuss Indian ideals and institutions; mistaking speculative materials for historical data; and neglecting contextual integrity while quoting from classics to substantiate the existence of modern concepts in primitive India.

It is a chief merit of Dr. Varma's book that it avoids the above pitfalls and pursues the subject matter in a spirit of scientific inquiry, free from propensities of national or cultural pride. In this scholarly treatise, a doctoral thesis for the University of Chicago, Dr. Varma describes and evaluates Indian political thought from the Rig-Veda (ca. 1500 B.C.) to the Manusmriti (ca. 100 B.C.) in terms of its origins and development, its nature, scope and significance.

In the first chapter, the author examines the historical origins and foundations of Hindu political philosophy. The political institutions of kingship, republicanism, Samiti (people's assembly) and Sabha (assembly of elders) are discussed in relation to the social structure. Along with theories of economic and racial origin of caste, note is taken of the mythical account of caste's inception showing how with the immolation of the god Purusha, his mouth became transformed into a priest, his arms into a warrior, his thighs into a husbandman, and his feet into a servant. However, the author fails to state that this Rig-Vedic hymn about Purusha has little to do with the creation of caste as such. The hymn is, in fact, a symbolical statement about the creation of the universe, since it also states that the sun emerged from Purusha's eyes, the moon from his mind, the sky from his head, fire (like the priest) from his mouth, earth (like the servant) from his feet, and breath and space from his ears.

An analysis of the fundamental concepts of Hindu political theory, e.g., Artha (wealth), Danda (punishment), Brahma (the Absolute), Kshatra (ruling power), Bala (material power), and Shakti (primal energy), is given in the second chapter. Dharma, "the most comprehensive concept in the entire history of Hindu thought," receives a thorough treatment in chapter three. The author takes issue with the view advanced by many Indian scholars, including Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, that Dharma was sovereign in Indian polity. He points out that despite a universal acceptance of the supremacy of the doctrine, there was no legal agency to prevent breaches of Dharma by the ruler. In this connection, the author's commentary on the political philosophy of the Bhagavad Gita is keen and provocative, but it does not justify his claim that such an analysis is rendered for "the first time."

The theories of kingship by election and by divine right are discussed in great detail in chapters four and five. Despite the existence of republican forms of government, the author rightly contends, Indian political theories were mostly concerned with the institution of monarchy. The doctrine of Karma (determinatio of the fortunes of man's life on the basis of hi conduct and deeds in previous incarnations) receives a rather generous interpretation. Th author seems to discount the fatalistic facets o Karma in favor of its ethical merits.

In the last three pages of the book, Dr Varma summarizes his conclusions, which considering the nature of the work, are fa from adequate. The primacy of spiritual value over political objectives, the author concludes prevented the rise of such issues as the individual *versus* the State, politics *versus* ethics, an the ruler's responsibility to the people. Nevertheless, he asserts that "there is a fundamenta spiritual and moral note in Hindu though which is surpassing in its proclamation of th sacred character of the individual huma personality. This emphasis on spirituality an morality in Hindu political thought is a grea contribution to world political thought."

Dr. Varma has written a scholarly book o an important subject. The diligence an minuteness with which he has treated hi subject are commendable. However, in his zea for detail and documentation, he has made th book exceptionally turgid and dry. Swarms o Sanskrit quotations without translation would be hardly welcome to scholars not versed i the epic language. Besides, one wishes tha the author had attached a bibliography for th benefit of the reader. With these reservations Dr. Varma's work has all the earmarks o sound scholarship.—CHATTAR SINGH SAMRA *University of California (Berkeley).*

The Self and the Dramas of History. BY REINHOLD NIEBUHR. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1955. Pp. ix, 242. $3.75.)

This book is basically a theological treatis in which Niebuhr stresses the three dialogue in which the Self finds itself involved. The firs is the empirical fact of the dialogue of th Self with itself, the second the Self's dialogu with its neighbors, and the third the seemingly empirically unverifiable dialogue of th Self with God. In the latter situation, th insight given by Biblical faith gives some hop of man's ability to grasp the "realm of myster beyond rational comprehension" and in thi way synthesize for life a meaning which canno be found in the partialness of the observe historic dramas of everyday existence. Th political theorist will find much of interest i this book: notably Niebuhr's emphasis on th Reformation's restoration of the Biblical mod of thought as against the Renaissance distillation of classic elements out of the medieval synthesis with a consequent emphasis on reason as the sole key to understanding human problems and personality. The effect of this latter development on the formulations both of Hobbes and the philosophers of the Enlightenment, and ultimately even upon Marx as traced out by the author, makes provocative reading. Part III of the book, which relates the Christian faith to contemporary problems of democracy, property, justice, and the international community, reiterates the approach developed and expounded by Niebuhr in his previous works. Here the political theorist will again find much of interest and value. The general tone of this work places Niebuhr firmly in the camp of Conservatism with a capital C, in Rossiter's use of the term, and should definitely refute those liberals who claim Niebuhr as their own. The toughness of Niebuhr's style makes the book slow and difficult reading, but the compensations derived from it in the form of philosophical insight and tightness of analysis far outweigh the labor involved in its perusal and mastery.—H. MALCOLM MACDONALD, *University of Texas.*

Modern German Political Theory. BY OTTO BUTZ. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc. 1955. Pp. 72. $ .95.)

This is a new title in the *Short Studies in Political Science* published by Doubleday. The author views the study of political theory as one of the most rewarding techniques for understanding the decision-making processes and related social aspects of any society. He therefore hopes in his present work to introduce the reader to the leading political theorists of Germany since 1870 and thereby reveal the basic problems and limitations conditioning the present status and the future potential of the West German Republic. After sketching the historical background of modern German political theory, the author presents his analysis under three headings: the political theory of Imperial Germany, characterized by *Staatsrechtswissenschaft*, *Rechtstaat*, and *Sozialpolitik* modified by the introduction of empiricism *via* Treitschke, Gierke, and Schmidt; the development of political ideas under the Weimar regime, marked by the rejection, in part, of the Imperial tradition and the introduction of contributions from political geography, sociology, and jurisprudence, plus the appearance of "true" political theory in the writings of Grabowsky and Heller; and, lastly, the intrusion of the Nazi ideology in the form of *Volksgemeinschaft*, the *Führerprinzip*, and the concept of *Staatsräson*. A brief statement on the future of German political theory concludes the study. Although brief in form, the work is a usable introduction to German thought and problems and provides a foundation for further specialized research. German political ideas have, with the exception of the Nazi period, been somewhat neglected in most undergraduate courses in American universities, and Professor Butz's monograph, it is hoped, may start a reversal of that trend.

Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology. BY JEAN PAUL SARTRE. TRANSLATED AND WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY HAZEL E. BARNES. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1956. Pp. lxix, 638. $10.00.)

This is the long overdue translation of Sartre's systematic exposition of the foundations of Existentialism, *L'Etre et le Néant*, which first appeared in France in 1943. The translation, though drier and more pedantic than the original (Is it possible to present Existentialism in English at all? Doesn't this kind of philosophy rely almost entirely on peculiar connotations of French or German?), is as faithful as it can be made. The translator has also corrected the errors of the French text and has provided occasional footnotes to elucidate her rendering of some of the more difficult expressions. Her introduction, though sound, is not likely to shed much light on the vagaries of Sartre's philosophy or to make easier for the uninitiated reader what he will find in the body of the book.

Concept of Freedom. EDITED BY REV. CARL W. GRINDEL. (Chicago: Henry Regnery Co. 1955. Pp. xii, 513. $10.00.)

In this thoughtful and provocative work, fifteen members of the faculty of St. John's University, New York, attempt an analysis of the fundamental nature of freedom and its relation to contemporary problems. The analysis is basically an Aristotelian-Thomistic one and formulated within the limitations of Roman Catholic assumptions. Each of the essays is a unit in itself; collectively they treat of the metaphysics and philosophy of freedom and its relation to government, law, economics, labor, education, aesthetics, and religion. The *leitmotif* of the work is that freedom truly conceived is freedom under God.

Power and Community. BY ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPÉ. (New York: Frederick A. Praeger. 1956. Pp. 134. $3.00.)

In this work Professor Strausz-Hupé presents a series of essays on the problem of power in the modern world. Specific chapters relate power to personality, history, science, the community, and security. While admitting the importance, indeed the dominance, of power motives in contemporary society, the author declines to admit the contentions of Russell, Lasswell, and Morgenthau that power is the key to history. There are for the author other explanations of history, among them the desire for dignity and freedom and the preservation of human liberty. Power is justified only when it is subordinated to these ends, and the challenge to modern man is to legitimize power by making it not an end in itself but a means for the attainment of more righteous and worthy goals.

The Bourgeoisie in 18th Century France. BY ELINOR G. BARBER. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1955. Pp. x, 165. $3.50.)

A historical-sociological study of the religious, economic, social, and political attitudes and practices of the eighteenth-century French bourgeoisie. The author maintains that the bourgeoisie did not constitute a revolutionary class bent on destroying the Old Regime but only slowly became antagonistic to the *status quo.*

Democracy and Dictatorship: Their Psychology and Patterns of Life. BY ZEVEDEI BARBU. (New York: Grove Press. 1956. Pp. viii, 275. $3.50.)

This work, by a Roumanian intellectual and diplomat now Lecturer in Social Psychology at the University of Glasgow, is an able and stimulating psychological analysis of the life patterns of democracy and dictatorship. The democratic way of life is expressed in a sociocultural complex in which confidence in reason, belief in human personality, and the presence of change compatible with security are predominant. Nazism develops out of insecurity, conditions of stress, and a loss of confidence in rationalism; it seeks compensation in mass identification and *Gleichschaltung.* Communism follows much the same pattern, with the element of irrationalism tending to outweigh that of emotionalism. The author's analysis of the impact of the human mind on the historic process and his discussion of the role of personality in history are of special interest. The book was originally published in England as one of the titles in the *International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction.*

Socialism and the Individual. BY WILLIAM ANGUS SINCLAIR. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1956. Pp. 168. $2.50.)

William Angus Sinclair was at the time of his death Reader in Philosophy at Edinburgh University. The book is an explanation of his abandonment of the Conservative Party in 1945 and a defense of the program and future of the Labor Party as he sees it. It may be read with profit by Americans interested in the intellectual reassessments going on in certain circles in Britain today.

A John LaFarge Reader. EDITED BY THURSTON N. DAVIS, S. J., AND JOSEPH SMALL, S. J.. (New York: The America Press. 1956. Pp. xiv, 272. $3.50.)

The volume contains three dozen articles and editorials by the former editor of the Jesuit weekly *America.* Father LaFarge has been a leading fighter for interracial justice and an opponent of isolationism. Topics include, *inter alia,* "Franco-American Understanding," "War Aid to Russia," and "The Basis of Interracial Peace."

At the Feet of Mahatma Gandhi. BY DR. RAJENDRA PRASAD. (New York: Philosophical Library. 1955. Pp. vii, 350. $6.00.)

A highly personal account by the President of India of three decades of social and political struggle, first written in Hindi in 1950 from what the author "felt and remembered" of his association with Gandhi. It permits the reader to follow the evolution of Gandhi's philosophy and method and contributes valuable insight into the nature of Gandhi's leadership and the character of the Indian response

Historical Atlas. BY WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD. (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc. 1956. 8th ed. Pp. xii, 226, 115. $12.50.)

Those who have regretted the long unavailability of Shepherd's *Historical Atlas* will welcome the new edition, which contains all the maps of the 7th revised and enlarged edition (1929) plus eight maps for the period since 1929, prepared by C. S. Hammond and Company. Since the original plates had been destroyed, the Shepherd maps have been reproduced—very successfully—by offset lithography. As in the 7th edition, the treatment of post-World War I history is somewhat disappointing; but as a whole the atlas still far surpasses its competitors.

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON

POLITICAL THEORY

ARNAUD B. LEAVELLE

Stanford University

History and Criticism

Anderle, Othmar. Giambattista Vico als Vorläufer einer morphologischen Geschichtsbetrachtung. *Die Welt Als Geschichte.* XVI/2, 1956.

Anderson, F. H. Plato's Aesthetics Reconsidered. *University of Toronto Quarterly.* July, 1956.

Benz, E. Luther et l'Église orthodoxe. *Irénikon.* XXVIII/4, 1955.

Berlin, Isaiah. Herzen and the Grand Inquisitors. *Encounter.* May, 1956.

Bluck, R. S. The *Parmenides* and the "Third Man." *The Classical Quarterly.* January–April, 1956.

Blumenberg, W. Ein Unbekauntes Kapitel Aus Marx' Leben. *International Review of Social History.* Vol. 1, Part 1, 1956.

Bressler, Leo A. The Anchor Club, Defender of Federalism. *The Pennsylvania Magazine.* July, 1956.

Brinton, Crane. Toynbee's City of God. *The Virginia Quarterly Review.* Summer, 1956.

Broome, J. H. Collins and Desmaizeaux. *Revue de Littérature Comparée.* April–June, 1956.

Brownlow, Louis. Woodrow Wilson and Public Administration. *Public Administration Review.* Spring, 1956.

Bruner, Jerome S. Freud and the Image of Man. *Partisan Review.* Summer, 1956.

Carlin, Edward A. Schumpeter's Constructed Type—The Entrepreneur. *Kyklos.* IX/1, 1956.

Cherry, George L. The Role of the Convention Parliament (1688–89) in Parliamentary Supremacy. *Journal of The History of Ideas.* June, 1956.

Chevallier, J. J. Reflexions sur le dernier ouvrage de Bertrand de Jouvenel. *Revue Francaise De Science Politique.* April–June, 1956.

Cisneros, Jose Marío Hernández-Rubio. Examen Político-Jurídico del siglo XIX. *Revista de la Facultad de Derecho, Universidad de Oviedo.* September, 1955.

Coulborn, Rushton. Fact and Fiction in Toynbee's *Study of History*. *Ethics.* July, 1956.

Coyle, Alcuin F. Cicero's *De officiis* and *De officiis ministrorum* of St. Ambrose. *Franciscan Studies.* September, 1955.

Dubarle, Dominique. Teilhard de Chardins Entwurf einer neuen Kosmologie. *Dokumente.* June, 1956.

Duroselle, J. B. Michel Chevalier saint-simoneon. *Revue Historique.* April–June, 1956.

Emerson, Everett H. Reginald Pecock: Christian Rationalist. *Speculum.* April, 1956.

Emerson, Everett H. Calvin and Covenant. *Church History.* June, 1956.

Eulau, Heinz. From Public Opinion to Public Philosophy [Lippmann]. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* July, 1956.

Fetscher, Iring. Uber Marx und die Gergenwart. *Archiv Für Rechts-und Sozialphilosophie.* XLII/2, 1956.

Fraser, C. M. Edward I of England and the Regalian Franchise of Durham. *Speculum.* April, 1956.

French, A. The Economic Background to Solon's Reforms. *The Classical Quarterly.* January–April, 1956.

Gelzer, Thomas. Aristophanes und sein Sokrates. *Museum Helveticum.* April, 1956.

Ghoraba, Hammouda. The Dilemma of Religion and Philosophy in Islam. *Islamic Quarterly.* December, 1955.

Grabowsky, Adolf. Robespierre: Versuch einer Charakteristik. *Zeitschrift für Politik.* December, 1955.

Greene, Theodore M., and others. Reinhold Niebuhr: A Symposium. *Union Seminary Quarterly Review.* May, 1956.

Guicheteau, Marcel. L'art et l'illusion chez Platon. *Revue Philosophique De Louvain.* May, 1956.

Haegglund, Bengt. Was Luther a Nominalist? *Theology.* June, 1956.

Hainchelin, Charles. Der Mythos Jesu. *Aufbau.* April, 1956.

Harrison, A. R. W. Law-making at Athens at the End of the Fifth Century B. C. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies.* 1955.

Heberle, Rudolf. A Note on Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd*. *The American Journal of Sociology.* July, 1956.

Hippel, Ernst von. Ideas políticas en las culturas pre-hispánicas. *Estudios Americanos.* February, 1956.

Hoffman, William S. Willie P. Mangum and the Whig Revival of the Doctrine of Instructions. *The Journal of Southern History.* August, 1956.

Hulme, Harold. The Winning of Freedom

of Speech by the House of Commons. *The American Historical Review*. July, 1956.

Islamic Civilization versus Western Civilization [Various Articles]. *Islamic Literature*. May–June, 1956.

Kaplan, Morton A. How Sovereign is Hobbes' Sovereign? *Western Political Quarterly*. June, 1956.

Kaplan, Sidney. Social Engineers as Saviors: Effect of World War I on Some American Liberals. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. June, 1956.

Kaufmann, Walter. Hegel-Legende und Wirklichkeit. *Zeitschrift Für Philosophische Forschung*. X/2, 1956.

Kenrick, Edward F. *Paradise Lost* and the *Index* of Prohibited Books. *Studies in Philology*. July, 1956.

King, Hugh R. Aristotle without Prima Materia. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. June, 1956.

Kohn, Hans. France Between Britain and Germany. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. June, 1956.

Krause, Anna. Unamuno and Tennyson. *Comparative Literature*. Spring, 1956.

Kroner, Richard J. Heidegger's Private Religion. *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*. May, 1956.

La Mountain, George F. J. The Concept of the Infinite in the Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. *The Thomist*. July, 1956.

Landmann, Michael. Platons Traktat von den drei Unsterblichkeiten. *Zeitschrift Für Philosophische Forschung*. X/2, 1956.

Lefebvre, Georges. A Historian's Remarks on the Transition from Feudalism to Capitalism. *Science and Society*. Summer, 1956.

Lekai, Louis J. Cardinal La Rochefoucauld and the Cistercian Reform. *American Benedictine Review*. Winter, 1955–56.

Levitt, Theodore. The Lonely Crowd and the Economic Man. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. February, 1956.

Lockwood, David. Some Remarks on "The Social System." *The British Journal of Sociology*. June, 1956.

McAlur, Edward C. Browning's "Cleon" and Auguste Comte. *Comparative Literature*. Spring, 1956.

Maurois, André. Metternich. *La Revue De Paris*. July, 1956.

Mellone, S. H. Voltaire. *The Hibbert Journal*. July, 1956.

Menzel, Johanna M. The Sinophilism of J. H. G. Justi. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. June, 1956.

Miller, S. J. T. The Position of the King in Bracton and Beaumanois. *Speculum*. April, 1956.

Moellering, R. L. Rauschenbusch in Retrospect. *Concordia Theological Monthly*. August, 1956.

Morris, Christopher. The Liberalism of the Enlightenment. *The Listener*. May 24, 1956.

Morris, Richard B. The Confederation Period and the American Historian. *The William and Mary Quarterly*. April, 1956.

Mulder, William. Image of Zion: Mormonism as an American Influence in Scandinavia. *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review*. June, 1956.

Müller, Georg. Eugen Rosenstock—ein Hegelianer? *Archiv Für Rechts-und Sozialphilosophie*. XLII/2, 1956.

Ong, W. J. System, space, and intellect in Renaissance symbolism. *Bibliothèque D'Humanisme et Renaissance*. May, 1956.

Ornstein, Robert. Donne, Montaigne, and Natural Law. *The Journal of English and German Philology*. April, 1956.

Peters, R. S. Freud's Theory. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*. May, 1956.

Platonism and Neo-Platonsim [Various Articles]. *Revue Philosophique*. January–March, 1956.

Pontalis, J. B. Freud aujourd'hui: I, II. *Les Temps Modernes*. May, June, 1956.

Richter, Will. Kritsches und Exegetisches zu Senecas Prosaschriften. *Hermes*. June, 1956.

Ricoeur, Paul. Note critique sur "Chine ouverte." *Esprit*. June, 1956.

Rivier, A. L'homme et l'expérience humaine dans les fragments d'Heraclite. *Museum Helveticum*. July, 1956.

Rodolsky, Roman. Zur neuren Kritik des Marxschen Gesetzes der fallenden Profitrate. *Kyklos*. IX/2, 1956.

Rouquette, R. Ignace De Loyola Dans Le Paris Intellectuel Du XVI^e Siècle. *Études*. July–August, 1956.

Rubel, Maximilien. L'état et le droit dans la "Deutsche Ideologie." *Archiv für Rechts-und Sozialphilosophie*. XLII/1, 1956.

Schmidt, Royal J. Cultural Nationalism in Herder. *Journal of the History of Ideas*. June, 1956.

Scholem, Gershom. The Meaning of the Torah in Jewish Mysticism. *Diogenes*. Summer, 1956.

Schutz, Alfred. Mozart and the Philosophers. *Social Science*. Summer, 1956.

Simon, Walter M. History for Utopia:

aint Simon and the Idea of Progress. *Journal f the History of Ideas.* June, 1956.

Smith, James Morton. John Adams Pardons Villiam Durrell: A Note on Sedition Proeedings, 1798–1800. *The New-York Historical ociety Quarterly.* April, 1956.

Sohier, Albert. Le catholicisme en Chine. *sprit.* June, 1956.

Steenberghen, Fernand Van. L'avnir du homisme. *Revue Philosophique De Louvain.* ay, 1956.

Streadbeck, Avral L. Juridical Redemption nd the *Grazer Marienleben. The Germanic eview.* April, 1956.

Ste. Croix, G. E. M. The Constitution of he Five Thousand. *Historia.* Heft 1, 1956.

Tarrant, Dorothy. Plato as Dramatist. *The ournal of Hellenic Studies.* 1955.

Thérive, Andre. Julien Benda. *La Revue es Deux Mondes.* July 15, 1956.

Thomas, Norman. The Socialism of Bernard haw. *The Socialist Call.* August, 1956.

Tilliette, Xavier. Die Philosophie Merleau-ontys. *Dokumente.* April, 1956.

Toynbee's Contributions [Various Articles]. *iogenes.* Spring, 1956.

Tucker, Robert C. The Cunning of Reason n Hegel and Marx. *Review of Politics.* July, 956.

Tucker, Robert C. Stalin and the Uses of sychology. *World Politics.* July, 1956.

Villey, Michel. Sur l'antique inclusion du roit dans la morale. *Archiv für Rechts-und ozialphilosophie.* XLII/1, 1956.

Wahl, J. L'"Introduction à la Metahysique" de M. Heidegger. *Revue de Metahysique et de Morale.* April–June, 1956.

Weigel, Gustave. The Theological Signifiance of Paul Tillich. *Cross Currents.* Spring, 956.

Wendon, John. Christianity, History, and Mr. Toynbee. *The Journal of Religion.* July, 956.

Wiese, Leopold V. G. D. H. Cole über oziale Klassen und Eliten. *Kyklos.* IX/1, 956.

Wilkins, Burleigh Taylor. James, Dewey, nd Hegelian Idealism. *Journal of the History f Ideas.* June, 1956.

Wilkins, Ernest H. Five Mazzini Letters. *talica.* June, 1956.

Williams, T. Harry. Thaddeus Stevens: An American Radical. *Commentary.* June, 1956.

Williams, William Appleman. On the Resoration of Brooks Adams. *Science and Society.* Summer, 1956.

Willson, Lawrence. Shakespeare and the Genteel Tradition in America. *New Mexico Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

Wilson, John B. A Transcendental Minority Report. *The New England Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Wolfe, Bertram D. Lenin "Consults" Hegel. *The Antioch Review.* June, 1956.

Worsley, P. M. Emile Durkheim's Theory of Knowledge. *The Sociological Review.* July, 1956.

Analysis

Baker, A. E. Toleration. *Theology.* August, 1956.

Bell, Daniel. The Theory of Mass Society. *Commentary.* July, 1956.

Benjamin, A. Cornelius. Mysticism and Scientific Discovery. *The Journal of Religion.* July, 1956.

Butterfield, H. The Role of the Individual in History. *History.* February and June, 1956.

Chiaromonte, Nicola. State Reason and Individual Reason. *Confluence.* July, 1956.

Coblentz, Stanley A. Truth Via the Tabulating Machine. *Prairie Schooner.* Summer, 1956.

Cranston, Maurice. The Rights of Man—III. *The Listener.* May 17, 1956.

Crosland, C. A. R. About Equality. *Encounter.* July, 1956.

Deininger, Whitaker T. Some Reflections on Epistemology and Historical Inquiry. *The Journal of Philosophy.* July 5, 1956.

Devons, Ely. The Role of the Myth in Politics. *The Listener.* June 21, 1956.

Easton, David. Limits of the Equilibrium Model in Social Research. *Behavioral Science.* April, 1956.

Fletcher, Ronald. Functionalism as a Social Theory. *The Sociological Review.* July, 1956.

Fortes, Meyer. The Study of Society. *The Listener.* June 14, 1956.

Friedman, Georges. Psychoanalysis and Sociology. *Diogenes.* Summer, 1956.

Garandy, Roger. De l'empirisme logique á la semantique. *Revue Philosophique.* April–June, 1956.

Gurvitch, Georges. Les caractères cardinaux des classes sociales. *Archiv Für Rechts-und Sozialphilosophie.* XLII/2, 1956.

Hasenfuss, Josef. Religion und Recht. *Archiv für Rechts-und Sozialphilosophie.* XLII/1, 1956.

Jorgensen, Carl. On the Possibility of Deducing What Ought To Be from What Is. *Ethics.* July, 1956.

Lacambra, Gaz y. Notas para una teoría

de la obligacíon política. *Revista de Estudios Politicos.* January–February, 1956.

Margenau, Henry. A Unified Method of Science: Can It Be Applied to Religion? *Christian Register.* May, 1956.

Marcson, Simon. Information, Education, Propaganda, and Attitude Change. *Phylon.* No. 2, 1956.

Maroger, Jean. L'évolution de l'idée de supranationalité. *Politique Étrangère.* June, 1956.

Mental Health. [Various Articles]. *Twentieth Century.* May, 1956.

Money, John. Mind-Body Dualism and the Unity of Bodymind. *Behaviorial Science.* July, 1956.

Murphy, Gardner. The Enigma of Human Nature. *Christian Register.* July, 1956.

Nelson, J. Robert. Tradition and Traditions as an Ecumenical Problem. *Theology Today.* July, 1956.

Pähler, Karl H. Verein und Sozialstruktur. *Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie.* XLII/2, 1956.

Partridge, P. H. Value Judgments and the Social Sciences. *Australian Journal of Politics and History.* May, 1956.

Platen, Alexander von. Die Abenteuer der Dialektik. *Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie.* XLII/1, 1956.

Political Communication [Various Articles]. *Public Opinion Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

Russell, Bertrand. Philosophical Analysis. *The Hibbert Journal.* July, 1956.

Sanchiz, José Bugeda. Los instrumentos de investigación en las ciencias sociales. *Revista de Estudios Politicos.* January–February, 1956.

Scheibert, Peter. Nihilismus und Revolution. *Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie.* XLII/1, 1956.

Schelling, T. C. An Essay on Bargaining. *American Economic Review.* June, 1956.

Shapley, Harlow. We Are Not Alone. *Christian Register.* July, 1956.

Skinner, B. F. Freedom and the Control of Men. *Perspectives U. S. A.* Spring, 1956.

Smith, John E. and others. The Christian in Philosophy. *The Christian Scholar.* June, 1956.

Stern, Alfred. Science and the Philosopher. *American Scientist.* July, 1956.

Taubes, Jacob. Four Ages of Reason. *Archiv für Rechts- und Sozialphilosophie.* XLII/1, 1956.

Tillich, Paul J. Religion. *Perspectives U. S. A.* Spring, 1956.

Topitsch, Ernst. Sozialtheorie und Gesellschaftgestaltung. *Archiv für Rechts-und Sozialphilosophie.* XLII/2, 1956.

Weigel, Gustave. Catholic and Protestant Theologies in Outline. *The American Scholar* Summer, 1956.

Weil, Eric. Good Sense or Philosophy *Diogenes.* Winter, 1955.

Wishy, Bernard W. Is There a Revolt Against Reason? *Political Science Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Yolton, John W. Individuality, Leadership, and Democracy. *Diogenes.* Winter, 1955.

Zajdlic, W. The Limitations of Social Sciences. *Kyklos.* IX/1, 1956.

Contemporary Issues

Amin, 'Osman. The Message of Muslim Thought. *Islamic Review.* July, 1956.

Arnavon, C. Les Nouveaux Conservateurs Américains. *Études Anglaises.* April–June, 1956.

Arnold, G. L. Notes on Fabianism. *The Twentieth Century.* June, 1956.

Aron, Raymond. Can War in the Atomic Age Be Limited? *Confluence.* July, 1956.

Bernard, Ellsworth. Communism Is Not the Question! *AAUP Bulletin.* Summer, 1956.

Bates, M. Searles. Religious Liberty: Recent Phases of the Problem. *Ecumenical Review.* July, 1956.

Bennett, John C. The Draft and Christian Vocation. *The Christian Century.* August 22, 1956.

Birnbaum, Norman. Religion in America. *The Listener.* May 24, 1956.

Bliven, Bruce. Why Are Intellectuals Distrusted? *The Pacific Spectator.* Spring, 1956.

Born, Max. Development and Essence of the Atomic Age. *Confluence.* July, 1956.

Britton, William E. Objectives of Higher Education in America. *AAUP Bulletin.* Summer, 1956.

Bunche, Ralph. Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy. *Ecumenical Review.* July, 1956.

Burnham, James. Why Secrets? *Confluence.* July, 1956.

Cairo, Aníbal Ismodes. América y la técnica. *Estudios Americos.* February, 1956.

Clark, Kenneth B. A Struggle for Complete Human Dignity. *Christian Register.* July, 1956.

Davies, Horton, Charles S. Braden, and Charles W. Ransom. Centrifugal Christian Sects. *Religion in Life.* Summer, 1956.

Dikelius, Otto. Christian Unity in a Divided Europe. *Ecumenical Review.* July, 1956.

Domenach, J. M. Again the Popular Front. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Drucker, Peter F. Organized Religion and e American Creed. *Review of Politics.* July, 56.

Dulles, Avery. The Legion of Decency. *merica.* June 2, 1956.

Dulles, John Foster. Positive Measures for ace. *Ecumenical Review.* July, 1956.

Fiedler, Leslie A. The Intellectual Roots of nti-Intellectualism. *The Pacific Spectator.* mmer, 1956.

Finer, S. E. In Defence of Pressure Groups. *he Listener.* June 7, 1956.

Finer, S. E. The Political Power of Private apital. *The Sociological Review.* July, 1956.

Fitzgibbon, Russell H. Revolutions: West- n Hemisphere. *The South Atlantic Quarterly.* ly, 1956.

Folejewski, Abigniew. Frustrations of Social- Realism. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art iticism.* June, 1956.

Galbraith, J. K. On the Economics of D. R. *Commentary.* August, 1956.

Galdston, Iago. Psychopathia Intellectualis. *he Pacific Spectator.* Spring, 1956.

Gillis, James M. Catholics and Intellectuals. *he Catholic World.* June, 1956.

Goodspeed, D. J. The Arts of Subversion. *ueen's Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

Globig, Fritz von. Die grossen Federn. *ussen Politik.* July, 1956.

Hammarskjold, Dag. Spiritual Impact on e United Nations. *Ecumenical Review.* July, 56.

Hamrighausen, E. G. Billy Graham and the otestant Predicament. *The Christian Cen- ry.* July 18, 1956.

Harmel, Claude. Le Parti Communiste et s Intellectuels. *La Revue Des Deux Mondes.* ay 15, 1956.

Hays, Paul R. Academic Freedom and ommunist Teachers. *Commentary.* June, 56.

Henderson, Hanford. Backsliding Liberal- m. *The Freeman.* July, 1956.

Hicks, Granville. Liberalism in the Fifties. *he American Scholar.* Summer, 1956.

Hocking, W. E. Christianity and the Faith the Coming World Civilization. *The Hib- rt Journal.* July, 1956.

Hudson, G. F. The Heirs of Stalin. *The wentieth Century.* August, 1956.

Hunt, N. C. Pressure Groups in the U. S. A. *ccidente.* March–April, 1956.

Hutchins, Robert M. Religion and Educa- on. *The Commonweal.* June 29, 1956.

Keeny, Barnaby C. Education and Progress—Then and Now. *ACLS Newsletter.* Spring, 1956.

Kocharian, S. Religion and Communism. *Caucasian Review.* No. 2, 1956.

Kohn, Hans. A New Look at Nationalism. *The Virginia Quarterly Review.* Summer, 1956.

Levitt, Theodore. The Changing Character of Capitalism. *Harvard Business Review.* July–August, 1956.

Lévy-Bruhl, Henri. Le culte de la personnalite. *La Revue Socialiste.* May, 1956.

Mus, Par Paul. Esquisse d'une situation sociologique du Bouddhisme. *Esprit.* June, 1956.

Naegele, Kaspar D. Clergymen, Teachers, and Psychiatrists. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science.* February, 1956.

Neuberger, Richard L. Principles or Party? *The Christian Century.* July 18, 1956.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. A Proposal to Billy Graham. *The Christian Century.* August 8, 1956.

Peltier, Hélène. La destalinisation. *Esprit.* July, 1956.

Porter. John. Concentration of Economic Power and the Economic Elite in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science.* May, 1956.

Poulain, Dorothy. French Catholic Left and Anti-Americanism. *The Catholic World.* May, 1956.

Romero, Francisco. Las corrientes filosóficas en el siglo XX. *Cuadernos.* July–August, 1956.

Ross, Ralph G. Academic Freedom and Faculty Status. *Commentary.* August, 1956.

Silone, Ignazio, and others. Ist Russland anders geworden? *Der Monat.* June, 1956.

Silvain, Rene. Les contradictions internes de l'U. R. S. S. post-stalinienne. *Revue Politique et Parlementaire.* July, 1956.

Souvarine, Boris. Le Stalinisme sans Staline. *La Revue de Paris.* June, 1956.

Sullivan, William J. The Catholic Liberal. *The Catholic World.* June, 1956.

Trapp, Jacob. Humanism and Beyond. *Christian Register.* July, 1956.

Viereck, Peter. A Third View of the New Deal. *New Mexico Quarterly.* Spring, 1956.

White, Helen C. Freedom to Teach. *AAUP Bulletin.* Summer, 1956.

Wolfe, Bertram D. Stalinism versus Stalin. *Commentary.* June, 1956.

Wolfe, Bertram D. Stalin's Ghost at the Party Congress. *Foreign Affairs.* July, 1956.

Legal Theory

Abrams, Charles. Civil Rights in 1956. *Commentary.* August, 1956.

Baker, Richard C. Self Incrimination: Is the Privilege an Anachronism? *American Bar Association Journal.* July, 1956.

Bard, A. S. Aesthetics and the Police Power. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology.* April, 1956.

Berman, Harold J. Law Reform in the Soviet Union. *The American Slavic and East European Review.* April, 1956.

Church-State Relations: Nineteenth Century Judicial Thought Concerning [Note]. *Minnesota Law Review.* May, 1956.

Crosskey, William Winslow. John Marshall and the Constitution. *University of Chicago Law Review.* Spring, 1956.

Dession, George H. Psychiatry and Public Policy. *Buffalo Law Review.* Fall, 1955.

Demkitz, Nonette. Congressional Investigation of Newspapermen, Authors, and Others in the Opinion Field—Its Legality Under the First Amendment. *Minnesota Law Review.* April, 1956.

Douglas, Paul H. (Senator). The Case for the Consumer of Natural Gas. *Georgetown Law Journal.* June, 1956.

Douglas, William O. (Justice). The Durham Rule: A Meeting Ground for Lawyers and Psychiatrists. *Iowa Law Review.* Summer, 1956.

Frankfurter, Felix (Justice), and others. Law and the Future: A Symposium. *Northwestern University Law Review.* May–June, 1956.

French Administrative Law [Various Articles]. *Revue du Droit Public et de la Science Politique.* March–April; May–June, 1956.

Gardner, George K. Free Speech in Public Places. *Boston University Law Review.* Spring, 1956.

Gest, John B. Dr. Wu and the Natural Law. *Pennsylvania Bar Association Quarterly.* June, 1956.

Graham, Howard Jay. "Builded Better than They Knew." Pt. 1: The Framers, the Railroads and the Fourteenth Amendment. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review.* Summer, 1956.

Greenberg, Jack. Social Scientists Take the Stand: A Review and Appraisal of their Testimony in Litigation. *Michigan Law Review.* May, 1956.

Hawley, Cameron. Morality vs. Legality. *Pennsylvania Bar Association Quarterly.* April, 1956.

Horowitz, Harold W. Legal Aspects c "Political Blacklisting" in the Entertainmen Industry. *Southern California Law Revie* April, 1956.

Hubbard, H. A. Artificial Insemination: Reply to Dean Tallin. *The Canadian Ba Review.* April, 1956.

Interposition: A Round Table [Variou Articles]. *Journal of Public Law.* Spring, 195

Kelsen, Hans. A "Dynamic" Theory c Natural Law. *Louisiana Law Review.* Jun 1956.

Llewellyn, Karl N. On What Makes Leg Research Worth While. *Journal of Legal Education.* VIII/4, 1956.

Markham, Jesse W. Report of the Attorne General's Committee on Antitrust Law *Quarterly Journal of Economics.* May, 1956.

McKay, Robert B. "With All Deliberat Speed": A Study of School Desegregatio *New York University Law Review.* June, 195

Perkins, Rollin M. Sampling the Evolutio of Social Engineering. *University of Pittsburg Law Review.* Spring, 1956.

Pittman, R. Carter. The Fifth Amendment Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. *America Bar Association Journal.* June, 1956.

Pound, Roscoe. The Causes of Popula Dissatisfaction with the Administration o Justice. *Baylor Law Review.* Winter, 1956.

Pound, Roscoe. The Supreme Court in ou System: A Review of Mr. Justice Jackson' Last Book. *American Bar Association Journa* May, 1956.

Randall, Charles H., Jr. Sir Edward Cok and the Privilege Against Self-incrimination *South Carolina Law Quarterly.* Summer, 1956

Rorty, James. Virginia's Creeping Desegregation. *Commentary.* July, 1956.

Self-Incrimination [Various Articles]. *Kentucky Law Journal.* Spring, 1956.

Shuman, Samuel I. Jurisprudence and th Analysis of Fundamental Legal Terms. *Journal of Legal Education.* VIII/4, 1956.

Simmons, Robert G. The Use and Abuse o Dissenting Opinions. *Louisiana Law Review* April, 1956.

Warren, Earl (C. J.). The Law and th Future. *Fortune.* November, 1955.

Westin, Alan F. Liberals and the Suprem Court. *Commentary.* July, 1956.

Yntema, Hessel E. Comparative Legal Research. *Michigan Law Review.* May, 1956.

SELECTED ARTICLES AND DOCUMENTS ON
METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

HERBERT A. SIMON
Carnegie Institute of Technology

Philosophy of Social Science

Bowman, Mary Jean. The Conference on esearch on Expectations, Uncertainty and usiness Behavior. *Items.* September, 1956.

March, James G. Sociological Jurisprudence evisited. *Stanford Law Review.* May, 1956.

Research Methods and Organization

Boguslaw, R. Sociometric Methodology and alid Cross-National Research. *International ocial Science Bulletin.* 1955, #4.

Comparative Cross-National Research: Bib- ography. *International Social Science Bulle- n.* 1955, #4.

Dukiker, H. C. C. Comparative Research in ocial Science. *International Social Science Bul- tin.* 1955, #4.

The Interview in Social Research. *American ournal of Sociology,* Whole number, Septem- r, 1956.

Key, V. O., Jr. Strategies in Research on ublic Affairs. *Items.* September, 1956.

Motivation and Personality

Arnhoff, Franklyn N. Ethnocentrism and timulus Generalization. *Journal of Abnormal d Social Psychology.*

Bernberg, Raymond E. Personality Corre- tes of Social Conformity: II. *Journal of ocial Psychology.* May, 1956.

Freeman, Howard E. and Gene G. Kasse- aum. The Illiterate in American Society. *ocial Forces.* May, 1956.

French, Elizabeth G. Motivation as a Vari- le in Work-Partner Selection. *Journal of Ab- rmal & Social Psychology.* July, 1956.

Kogan, Nathan. Authoritarianism and De- ression. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psy- ology.* July, 1956.

Neems, Ralph and Alvin Scodel. Authori- arianism and Level of Aspiration Scores. *Jour- al of Social Psychology.* May, 1956.

Wells, William D., Guy Weinert and Mari- n Rubel. Conformity Pressure and Authori- arian Personality. *Journal of Social Psychol- gy.* May, 1956.

Opinions and Attitudes

Asch, Solomon E. Studies of Independence and Conformity I. *Psychological Monographs #416.* 1956.

Belbin, Eunice. The Effects of Propaganda on Recall, Recognition and Behaviour. *British Journal of Psychology.* August, 1956.

Clark, K. E., and R. L. Jones. Changes in Attitude Toward a Low-Rent Housing Project. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* June, 1956.

Dunnette, M. D., W. H. Uphoff, and M. Aylward. The Effect of Lack of Information on the Undecided Response in Attitude Surveys. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* June, 1956.

Eulau, Heinz. Identification with Class and Political Perspective. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1956.

Gilbert, Thomas F. Experiments in Morale. *Journal of Social Psychology.* May, 1956.

Jones, Edward E., and Jane Aneshansel. The Learning and Utilization of Contravaluant Material. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology.* July, 1956.

King, Bert. T., and Irving L. Janis. Comparison of the Effectiveness of Improvised versus Non-Improvised Role-Playing in Producing Opinion Changes. *Human Relations.* May, 1956.

London, Ivan D., and Miriam B. London. Differential Reactions of Recent and Earlier Defectors to Anti-Soviet Propaganda Themes. *Psychological Reports.* September, 1956.

London, Ivan D., and Oleg Anisimov. Nonthematic, Non-technical Factors Influencing the Effectiveness of Plausible Appeals Directed to a Soviet Audience. *Psychological Reports.* September, 1956.

London, Ivan D., and Miriam B. London. Soviet Reaction to the Downgrading of Stalin. *Psychological Reports.* September, 1956.

Richter, Maurice N. The Conceptual Mechanism of Stereotyping. *American Sociological Review.* October, 1956.

Runkel, Philip J. Cognitive Similarity in Facilitating Communication. *Sociometry.* September, 1956.

Secord, Paul F., and William Bevan. A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Impressions of Physiognomy and Personality in Faces. *Journal of Social Psychology.* May, 1956.

THE ARMY LIBRARY
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Group Behavior, General

Agger, Robert E. Power Attributions in the Local Community. *Social Forces.* May, 1956.

Bates, Frederick L. Position, Role and Status: A Reformulation of Concepts. *Social Forces.* May, 1956.

Berkowitz, Leonard. Social Desirability and Frequency of Influence Attempts as Factors in Leadership Choice. *Journal of Personality.* June, 1956.

Borgatta, Edgar F., and Robert F. Bales. Sociometric Status Patterns and Characteristics of Interaction. *Journal of Social Psychology.* May, 1956.

Cartwright, Rosalind D., Julius Seeman, and Donald L. Grummon. Patterns of Interpersonal Relations. *Sociometry.* September, 1956.

Davis, James. Status Symbols and the Measurement of Status Perception. *Sociometry.* September, 1956.

Dittes, James J., and Harold H. Kelley. Effects of Different Conditions of Acceptance Upon Conformity to Group Norms. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology.* July, 1956.

Fanelli, A. Alexander. A Typology of Community Leadership. *Social Forces.* May, 1956.

Fanelli, A. Alexander. Extensiveness of Communication Contacts and Perceptions of the Community. *American Sociological Review.* August, 1956.

Harsanyi, John C. Approaches to the Bargaining Problem Before and After the Theory of Games. *Econometrica.* April, 1956.

Hemphill, John K. and others. The Relation Between Possession of Task-Relevant Information and Attempts to Lead. *Psychological Monographs.* 1956, #414.

Lenski, Gerhard E. Social Participation and Status Crystallization. *American Sociological Review.* August, 1956.

Luce, R. Duncan, and Ernest W. Adams. The Determination of Subjective Characteristic Functions in Games with Misconceived Payoff Functions. *Econometrica.* April, 1956.

Mishler, Elliot G. and Asher Tropp. Status and Interaction in a Psychiatric Hospital. *Human Relations.* May, 1956.

Schelling, T. C. An Essay on Bargaining. *American Economic Review.* June, 1956.

Shuval, Judith T. Patterns of Inter-Group Tension and Affinity. *International Social Science Bulletin.* 1956, #1.

Sussman, Marvin B. "The Calorie Collectors": A Study of Spontaneous Group Formation. *Social Forces.* May, 1956.

Organization Behavior

Bell, Wendell, and Maryanne T. Force. S
cial Structure and Participation in Differe
Types of Formal Associations. *Social Force*
May, 1956.

Bennis, Warren G. Values and Organizatic
in a University Social Research Group. *Amer*
can Sociological Review. October, 1956.

Berkowitz, Leonard. Group Norms Amo
Bomber Crews. *Sociometry.* September, 1956

Chandler, Alfred D., Jr. Management D
centralization: An Historical Analysis. *Busine*
History Review. June, 1956.

Chapin, F. Stuart, and John E. Tsoudero
The Formalization Process in Voluntary Ass
ciations. *Social Forces.* May, 1956.

Demerath, Nicholas J., and John W. Th
baut. Small Groups and Administrative O
ganizations. *Administrative Science Quarterl*
September, 1956.

Litchfield, Edward H. Notes on a Gener
Theory of Administration. *Administrative Sc*
ence Quarterly. June, 1956.

Lystad, Mary H., and Robert C. Ston
Bureaucratic Mass Media. *Social Forces.* Ma
1956.

Mack, John A. The Glacier Metal Exper
ments. *The Political Quarterly.* July–Septen
ber, 1956.

Parsons, Talcott. Sociological Approach
the Theory of Organizations. *Administrati*
Science Quarterly. June and September, 1956

Richardson, Stephen A. Organization
Contrasts on British and American Ship
Administrative Science Quarterly. Septembe
1956.

Suojanen, Waino W. Substantive Dece
tralization in the Large Corporation. *Advance*
Management. September, 1956.

Urwick, Lyndall F. The Manager's Span
Control. *Harvard Business Review.* May–Jun
1956.

Voting Behavior

Buchanan, William. An Inquiry Into Pu
posive Voting. *Journal of Politics.* May, 195

Ogburn, William F., and Charles M. Grig
Factors Related to the Virginia Vote on Segr
gation. *Social Forces.* May, 1956.

Pennock, J. Roland. Party and Constituenc
in Postwar Agricultural Price-Support Legisl
tion. *Journal of Politics.* May, 1956.

Pool, Ithiel de Sola (ed.). Studies in Politic
Communication. *Public Opinion Quarterl*
Spring, 1956 (whole number).

Rokkan, S. Party Preferences and Opinio

tterns in Western Europe. *International So- l Science Bulletin.* 1955, #4.

Culture and Institutions

Eisenstadt, S. N. Patterns of Leadership and cial Homogeneity in Israel. *International cial Science Bulletin.* 1956, #1.

Harbison, Frederick. Entrepreneurial Or- nization as a Factor in Economic Develop- ent. *Quarterly Journal of Economics.* August, 56.

Hobhouse, L. T. The Simplest Peoples: Part —Peace and Order Among the Simplest eoples. *British Journal of Sociology.* June, 56.

Johnson, D. Gale. Observations on the conomy of the USSR. *Journal of Political conomy.* June, 1956.

Martin, Walter T. The Structuring of Social elationships Engendered by Suburban Resi- nce. *American Sociological Review.* August, 56.

Morris, Richard T. National Status and At- tudes of Foreign Students. *Journal of Social ssues.* 1956, #1.

"Occupational Choice: A Conceptual Frame- ork." *Industrial & Labor Relations Review.* uly, 1956.

Philblad, C. T., and C. L. Gregory. The ole of Test Intelligence and Occupational ackground as Factors in Occupational hoice. *Sociometry.* September, 1956.

Svalastoga, K., E. Høgh, M. Pedersen, and Schild. Differential Class Behavior in Denmark. *American Sociological Review.* August, 1956.

Warren, Roland L. Toward a Typology of Extra-Community Controls Limiting Local Community Autonomy. *Social Forces.* May, 1956.

Williams, Robin M., Jr., Burton R. Fisher, and Irving L. Janis. Educational Desegregation as a Context for Basic Social Science Research. *American Sociological Review.* October, 1956.

Willis, Richard H. Political and Child-Rearing Attitudes in Sweden. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology.* July, 1956.

Youmans, E. Grant. Occupational Expectations of Twelfth Grade Michigan Boys. *Journal of Experimental Education.* June, 1956.

Value Theory and Social Policy

Dobzhansky, Theodosius, and Gordon Allen. Does Natural Selection Continue to Operate in Modern Mankind? *American Anthropologist.* August, 1956.

Fisher, Franklin M. Income Distribution, Value Judgments, and Welfare. *Quarterly Journal of Economics.* August, 1956.

MacDougall, G. D. A. Does Productivity Rise Faster in the United States? *Review of Economics and Statistics.* May, 1956.

Nourse, Edwin G. Defining Our Employment Goal Under the 1946 Act. *Review of Economics and Statistics.* May, 1956.

Schultz, Theodore W. Reflections on Agricultural Production, Output, and Supply. *Journal of Farm Economics.* August, 1956.

OTHER BOOKS RECEIVED

BRAHAM, HENRY J. *Government as Entrepreneur and Social Servant.* Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press. 1956. Pp. 62. $1.00.

ERKOVITS, ELIEZER. *Judaism: Fossil or Ferment?* New York: Philosophical Library. 1956. Pp. xii, 176. $4.50.

RILL, JOHN. *The Chance Character of Human Existence.* New York: Philosophical-Library. 1956. Pp. 150. $3.75.

RUNER, JEROME S.; GOODNOW, JACQUELINE J.; AND AUSTIN, GEORGE A. *A Study of Thinking: An Analysis of Strategies in the Utilization of Information for Thinking and Problem Solving.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; London: Chapman & Hall, Ltd. 1956. Pp. x, 330. $5.50.

DUNLAP, A. M. *Behind the Bamboo Curtain: The Experience of an American Doctor in China.* Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press. 1956. Pp. 208. $3.75.

EISENSTADT, A. S. *Charles McLean Andrews: A Study in American Historical Writing.* New York: Columbia University Press. 1956. Pp. xx, 273. $5.00.

FRANKLIN, JOHN HOPE. *The Militant South, 1800–1861.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. xi, 315. $5.00.

FRASER, PETER. *The Intelligence of the Secretaries of State: Their Monopoly of Licensed News, 1660–1688.* New York: Cambridge University Press. 1956. Pp. xi, 177. $3.75.

GREEN, GILBERT. *The Enemy Forgotten.* New York: International Publishers. 1956. Pp. 318. $3.50.

HANKIN, FRANCIS. *Making Democracy Work.*

Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press. 1956. Pp. 74. $1.00.

HARRIS, MARVIN. *Town and Country in Brazil.* New York: Columbia University Press. 1956. Pp. x, 302. $4.50.

HEGEL, GEORG WILHELM. *The Philosophy of History.* Introduction by C. J. Friedrich. New York: Dover Publication, Inc., 1956. Pp. xvi, 457. $1.75.

HODGSON, SISTER M. MICHAEL CATHERINE, O.P. *Caleb Cushing: Attorney General of the United States, 1853–1857.* Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press. Pp. vii, 247. $2.75.

HUEBNER, THEODORE AND VOSS, CARL HERMANN. *This is Israel. Palestine: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow.* New York: Philosophical Library. 1956. Pp. x, 166. $3.75.

KENTUCKY LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH COMMISSION. *The Legislative Process in Kentucky.* Frankfort, Kentucky: Legislative Research Commission. 1955. Pp. 244.

LAUGHARNE, GRACE. *Canada Looks Ahead.* London and New York: Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1956. Pp. ix, 158. $2.25.

LESLIE, R. F. *Polish Politics and the Revolution of November 1830.* London: The Athlone Press; New York: John De Graff, Inc. 1956. Pp. xii, 307. $7.50.

LI, DUN J. *British Malaya: An Economic Analysis.* New York: The American Press. 1955. Pp. 121. $3.00.

O'NEIL, JOHN TETTEMER. *Policy Formation in Railroad Finance: Refinancing the Burlington, 1936–1945.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. xii, 234. $4.50.

RAEFF, MARC. *Siberia and the Reform of 182* Seattle: University of Washington Pres 1956. Pp. xvii, 210. $3.50.

REOCK, ERNEST C., JR. AND FRIEDELBAUM STANLEY H. *Congressional Districting i New Jersey.* New Brunswick, N. J.: Burea of Government Research, Rutgers University. 1956. Pp. vii, 42, A-32, B-33, C-31 D-5. $2.00.

ROGERS, WILLIAM C. *Community Educatio in World Affairs.* Minneapolis: University o Minnesota Press. 1956. Pp. vi, 86. $1.25.

ROTHE, BERTHA M. (ED.) *Daniel Webste Reader.* New York: Oceana Publications 1956. Pp. 255. $1.00.

SALOUTOS, THEODORE. *They Remember America: The Story of the Repatriated Greek Americans.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1956. Pp. 153 $3.50.

SETH, RONALD. *The Undaunted: The Story o Resistance in Western Europe.* New York Philosophical Library. 1956. Pp. 327. $6.00

SINCLAIR, KEITH. *Imperial Federation: A Stud of New Zealand Policy and Opinion, 1880-1914. Commonwealth Papers, No. II.* New York: John De Graff, Inc. 1956. Pp. 51 $1.00.

TAYLOR, GEORGE ROGERS AND NEU, IRENE D *The American Railroad Network, 1861–1890* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1956. Pp. viii, 113. $3.75.

TOKAEV, G. A. *Soviet Imperialism.* New York Philosophical Library, Inc. 1956. Pp. 73 $2.75.

YESELSON, ABRAHAM. *United States-Persian Diplomatic Relations, 1883–1921.* New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press. 1956. Pp. ix, 252. $5.00.

NEWS AND NOTES

PROFESSIONAL CONFERENCES

INFORMATION ON THE 1957 PROGRAM

The Program Committee for the 1957 Annual Meeting met at the Association's National Office in Washington on October 26th and chose as a general theme: "The Shifting Balance of Political Power: National and International Problems." Any member of the Association desiring to participate in the program either by giving a paper or as a listed discussant is cordially invited to communicate with the Committee member in charge of panels in his area of interest. Committee members and their sections are:

Austin Ranney, University of Illinois—Chairman.
Joseph LaPalombara, Michigan State University—Comparative Government.
Roland Young, Northwestern University—National Government.
Robert J. Harris, Vanderbilt University—Constitutional Law.
Warren E. Miller, University of Michigan—Political Behavior.
Kenneth W. Thompson, The Rockefeller Foundation—International Law and Relations.
Herbert Kaufman, Yale University—State and Local Government (address: 155 E. Mosholu Parkway North, New York 67, N. Y.).
Samuel Eldersveld, University of Michigan—Political Parties.
Norman Wengert, University of Maryland—Public Administration.
Herbert Deane, Columbia University—Political Theory.

Fifty-second Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association: Minutes of the Council Meeting

The Council of The American Political Science Association met at 9:30 A.M., September 5, 1956 at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., with President Harold D. Lasswell in the chair. The following officers and members of the Council were present: Gabriel A. Almond, Stephen K. Bailey, James M. Burns, Gwendolen M. Carter, Weldon Cooper, Paul T. David, Samuel J. Eldersveld, Wilson Gaddis, Claude E. Hawley, Norman L. Hill, Thomas P. Jenkin, Max M. Kampelman, Evron M. Kirkpatrick, Earl Latham, Harold D. Lasswell, Avery Leiserson, Leslie M. Lipson, Harvey C. Mansfield, Louise Overacker, Norman Palmer, Emmette S. Redford, Charles B. Robson, E. E. Schattschneider.

Also present at the Countil Meeting were the new nominees for the Council, for Vice President, and President Elect, as well as the following past Presidents of the Association: Francis Coker, Pendleton Herring, Arthur W. Macmahon, and Quincy Wright.

The Chairman of the Program Committee, Earl Latham, reported for the Committee. He called particular attention to two innovations in the work of the Committee: (1) the Committee held a meeting in Washington, D. C. in October 1955 and (2) the program was organized around a central theme, namely: commemoration of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial. He recommended that the practice of holding a meeting of the Committee be continued and strongly urged that the next year's Committee explore the possibility of a central theme for the 1957 program. The Council accepted the report and unanimously adopted a resolution commending and thanking the Program Committee for its excellent work on the 1956 program.

The Managing Editor of THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE REVIEW, Harvey C. Mansfield, read his report, copies of which were distributed to members of the Council. Mr. Mansfield, in his report as Managing Editor, expressed appreciation to his predecessor, Hugh Elsbree, for seeing the publication of the Review through the June issue and to Emmette Redford for carrying on the Book Review section through that issue. Mr. Mansfield summarized Review problems as follows: (1) the quarterly can operate on substantially its present financing only by a large measure of decentralization of responsibilities and cooperation of individuals and institutions: (2) the volume of manuscripts is so heavy that it poses many editorial problems, principally those of determining the most promising of the borderline possibilities, soliciting some manuscripts, and calling on many colleagues to help out as readers. He closed his report by moving that the following persons be appointed to the Board of Editors for the coming year: Wallace S. Sayre and Samuel H. Beer, Associate Editors, and Hugh Elsbree, Edgar S. Furniss, Jr., Alexander Heard, Victor L. Jones, and Leo Strauss. Miss Carter seconded the motion and the report was approved unanimously.

The Chairman of the Nominating Committee, Benjamin E. Lippincott, read his report, copies of which were distributed to members of the Council. He emphasized the following points: (1) that essentially the same procedures were followed as in the past, including invitations to individual members of the Association, Regional and District Associations' past Presidents, and Departments of Political Science to suggest names; (2) that the criteria used, particularly with respect to the President and the Vice Presidents, were scholarship and contributions to the Association's work; and also, with regard to the Council, geographical spread, fields of specialization and attention to the smaller colleges; (3) that for the third consecutive year an organized campaign for a particular nominee for President Elect was conducted; despite the appearance of this form of "pressure" the Committee gave full consideration to this nominee's qualifications, noting that, while there is no constitutional objection to such a campaign, the Committee felt that spontaneous suggestions were more impressive than organized ones; (4) that the Committee had proved to its own satisfaction that a meeting of the Committee prior to balloting was most beneficial, since it brought about a greater pooling of knowledge than could be accomplished by correspondence, avoided "mathematical accident," facilitated balance in distribution of offices according to geography and fields, and saved time; (5) that a mail ballot was considered but was no recommended, for several reasons, includin the criteria mentioned in (2) above, and th desirability of charging one group with th responsibility of studying and locating especially well qualified candidates suggested b the membership; (6) that present procedure be improved by giving more prominence in th Review to the Nominating Committee's request for suggestions from individual member and departments; furnishing the Chairman o the Committee with a list of departmenta chairmen (in order to suggest to them personally that their departments submit nominations collectively, or as individuals); maintaining in the national office and supplyin to the incoming chairman each year a list o Association offices held by members during th past 25 years, and maintaining an alphabetica appendix at the end of each Directory of al past officers, including their offices and date of incumbency.

Mr. Lippincott reported that the Committe had unanimously agreed on the followin nominees as officers of the Association fo 1956–57: President Elect: V. O. Key (Harvar University); Vice Presidents: Carl Bren Swisher (The Johns Hopkins University), Wilfred Binkley (Ohio Northern University), Albert Lepawsky (University of California, Berkeley); Secretary: Gladys Kammerer (University of Kentucky); Treasurer: Max M. Kampelman (Washington, D. C.); Council: William T. R. Fox (Columbia University), Ruth Weintraub (Hunter College), John D. Lewis (Oberlin College), Thomas Eliot (Washington University, St. Louis), Alexander Heard (University of North Carolina), York Willbern (University of Alabama), Allan Saunders (University of Hawaii), Christian Larsen (Sacramento State College). Mr. Almond moved and Mr. Hawley seconded acceptance of the report. The motion was carried unanimously.

Treasurer Max M. Kampelman summarized briefly the information contained in the auditor's report, copies of which were distributed to members of the Council. Mr. Kampelman noted particularly that expenses were over $3,000 less than the 1956 budget adopted at the Boulder Annual Meeting in 1955 and income was over $4,500 more than the amount provided for in that budget. The result of operations in 1955–56, therefore, is that a budgeted deficit of more than $4,000 was turned into a surplus of $3,635.37. The Treasurer also called attention to the auditor's report of ecent defalcations by the bookkeeper of the the Association, which will be recovered from the bonding company. The Executive Director explained the conditions of the loss and its discovery in detail and asked for the advice of the Council on future action. Following the discussion, Mr. Bailey moved that the Council express their confidence in the Executive Director and authorize him to proceed to protect the Association's interests humanely. Miss Carter seconded the motion and it was approved unanimously.

The Executive Director reviewed the work of the National Office during the year 1955–56. He reported that the membership was now over 6,000, explained the present status of the program of Awards to Journalists in the 12 midwestern states for excellent reporting of state and local public affairs, discussed the relationships of the Association with the Foundations, reviewed the work of various committees, explained the operation of the Personnel Placement Service and reported on proposed revisions of procedures, and reviewed the Congressional Fellowship program. He then called attention to the Minutes of Executive Committee meetings held during the year, copies of which had been distributed to the Council, and reviewed briefly the major items contained therein. After brief discussion of some items of the report, Mr. Almond moved and Mr. Hawley seconded a motion to accept the report. The Council approved unanimously.

President Lasswell reported the recommendation of the Executive Committee that Mr. Gabriel Almond be elected as a representative of the Association on the Board of Directors of the Social Science Research Council. On a motion of Mr. Redford, seconded by Mr. Robson, the recommendation was unanimously approved by the Council.

The Executive Director reported discussion with Banta Publishing Company about the continued storage of back issues of the REVIEW. After discussion, on motion by Mr. Leiserson, seconded by Mr. Almond, the Executive Director was instructed by unanimous vote to ask Banta to continue their present policy of storing back issues; any new policy on this matter is to be cleared with the Executive Committee.

The Executive Director outlined the proposal for publication of a Wilson memorial volume based on the papers delivered at the Annual Meeting. On motion of Mr. Almond, seconded by Mr. Lipson, the Council approved the proposal in principle, with Mr. Latham as editor. The Executive Committee was authorized to make the final determination on the basis of a plan to be presented to it after further exploration by Mr. Latham and the Executive Director.

Mr. Lasswell reviewed discussions with the Governmental Affairs Institute during the year concerning its relations with the APSA. The minutes of the Executive Committee report fully on these discussions and their results. A committee of the Association composed of Messrs. Latham, Kirkpatrick and Lasswell, and a committee of GAI composed of Messrs. Litchfield, Gulick and Pollock, had agreed that the best solution of the relationship between the two organizations would be (1) to establish formally that they are separate, independent organizations and that neither has any dependence on or control over the other; and (2) to enter into a formal contract governing the use of the Political Science Building. Both points were approved by the Executive Committee. Copies of the exchange of letters between Messrs. Litchfield and Lasswell relating to point (1) and of the contract relating to the building were included in materials furnished to the Council. After reviewing the minutes, examining the letters and contract, and having a brief discussion, Mr Leiserson moved and Mr. Cooper seconded acceptance of the Lasswell report and the recommendations of the Executive Committee. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Lasswell reported that the Executive Committee during the year had discussed an overall program for the Association and called on the Executive Director to outline briefly the highlights of the draft of this program statement that had been supplied to the Council. Mr. Kirkpatrick reviewed the program statement which attempts to set up categories that will include the various activities of the Association. These categories are: Basic Professional and Liberal Education, Continuing Professional Education, Basic Civic Education, Continuing Civic Education, Consultation, Publications, Informed Civic Judgment and Effective Civic Action. He then discussed the various ongoing and proposed programs that fit into these categories: the Self Survey, Congressional Fellowship Program, Awards to Journalists, Facilitation of Exchange Professorships, Continuing Conferences, Regional Seminars, and Monograph Series.

After brief discussion, it was moved by Mr. Burns and seconded by Mr. Almond that the Council accept the report and authorize further exploration of the proposed projects by the Executive Director and Executive Committee. The motion carried unanimously.

The Executive Director outlined a project proposed by Mr. Pollock, President of the International Political Science Association, to request funds from a foundation to support the travel of representatives from various social science fields to the meetings of their respective International Associations. Mr. Kirkpatrick reported on conversations with the other social science organizations—all of which had approved the submission of a joint proposal by The American Political Science Association. Mr. Palmer moved and Miss Carter seconded acceptance of the report and authorization for the Executive Director to proceed in cooperation with Mr. Pollock to submit a proposal for foundation support. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. David presented the following two resolutions for consideration by the Council:

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON PRINTING THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTIONS

Whereas, the printing of the proceedings of the national party conventions has been greatly delayed in recent years, the proceedings of the Republican National Convention of 1952 not having appeared until the following year, and those of the Democratic National Convention not having appeared until 1954, and

Whereas, the proceedings have been distributed in limited editions only, in part because of Hatch Act difficulties, real or alleged; have often gone out of print while still in demand; and have frequently been difficult to obtain through any orderly procedure, and

Whereas, the verbatim record of the debates and votes of the national party conventions constitutes documentary material that is greatly needed for voting analysis, research, and reference purposes by the members of The American Political Science Association and by other students of politics and political parties,

Be It Resolved, that the National Committees of the Democratic and Republican Parties are hereby urged and requested to publish the proceedings of the national party conventions of 1956 with all possible speed, and

Be It Further Resolved, that the appropriate Congressional authorities are urged and requested to reprint the 1956 proceedings of the two national party conventions as a public document for general distribution a soon as possible.

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE NEED FOR IMPROVED FACILITIES FOR RESEARCH AT THE NATIONAL PARTY CONVENTIONS

Whereas, with the growing size and increasing congestion of the national party conventions, the opportunities for observation an research by professional political scientists an historians have become more and more unsatisfactory, with many difficulties in securin access even to those parts of the proceeding that are supposed to take place in public,

Be It Resolved, that the Democratic an Republican Parties be urged and requested when making arrangements for future nationa party conventions, to make an appropriate allocation of the available facilities for observin and reporting on the conventions, to be assigned to such professional political scientist and historians as may wish to come to the conventions for purposes of scholarly research leading to book and other publication unde responsible academic and professional auspices.

On motion by Mr. Eldersveld and second b Miss Carter the resolutions were unanimousl approved and Mr. David was requested to prepare final drafts for submission to the Busines Meeting.

The Executive Director raised the questio of publishing a new Directory. After some discussion indicating general approval of publication of a new Directory of 1958, Mr. Baile moved and Miss Carter seconded a resolutio that the Executive Director prepare a financia report on the 1953 Directory, explore the cost of printing a new Directory, and submit thi information to the Executive Committee fo final decision.

Mr. Lasswell called on Mr. Palmer to summarize the memorandum he had prepared an distributed to Council members relating to th responsibilities of the Council and its participation in governing the Association. Mr. Palmer briefly outlined his views that the Counci should play a larger and more important rol in the Association. The Executive Directo supported Mr. Palmer's views and expresse his desire to take whatever action he can t achieve this end. Mr. Lasswell and Mr. Schattschneider expressed accord. There was genera discussion by the Council and a number of constructive suggestions for keeping the Counci better informed, for utilizing the Council more ffectively, and for improving Council meetngs. At the end of the discussion, on motion of Mr. Burns and second by Miss Overacker, the Council unanimously approved a vote of conidence in and appreciation of the Executive Director for his handling of Association affairs and, at the same time, expressed the view that very effort should be made to improve the low of information to the Council and to make ffective use of its advice and guidance.

Mr. Lasswell raised the question of location of the 1958 meeting. After general discussion, Mr. Bailey moved and Mr. Almond seconded a motion to have the 1958 meeting in the Midwest and to leave the decision as to the specific ity to the Executive Committee. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Lasswell called on the Executive Diector to review the budget proposal for 1956–57, copies of which had been distributed to the Council. Mr. Kirkpatrick reviewed the financial situation briefly and explained the 1956–57 proposals. Mr. Bailey moved and Mr. Hawley seconded acceptance of the proposed 1956–57 budget with the understanding that shifts can be made in items by the Executive Director with the approval of the Executive Committee. The Council approved unanimously.

Mr. Bailey moved and Mr. Hawley seconded a unanimous vote of thanks to the Stern Family Fund for its generous support of the Association and the Congressional Fellowship program in 1955–56.

Mr. Almond moved and Mr. Burns seconded a vote of thanks to Father James B. Horigan of Georgetown University, Chairman, and the members of the Local Arrangements Committee for their fine work in arranging the 1956 Annual Meeting.

Mr. Lasswell adjourned the meeting at 6:15 P.M.

Minutes of the Annual Business Meeting

The Annual Business Meeting of The Amercan Political Science Association was held at 4:30 P.M., Friday, September 7, 1956 in the Presidential Ballroom of the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C. The meeting was called to order by President Harold D. Lasswell, who made a brief report on the activities of the Association during the preceding year.

Mr. Mansfield, Secretary of the Association, summarized the decisions taken by the Council at its meeting of September 5, 1956 and read the two resolutions the Council had authorized Mr. David to prepare (for the texts, see the Council Minutes). The report of the Secretary and the two resolutions, were approved unanimously.

Mr. Latham, Chairman of the Program Committee for the 1956 Annual Meeting, reported on the activities of the Committee. The two most important innovations in the work in 1956 were (1) the meeting of the Program Committee and (2) building the program around a central theme. He recommended that both be continued next year. At the conclusion of the report, a resolution thanking the Program Committee for its excellent work was adopted unanimously.

Mr. Kampelman, Treasurer, presented the financial report for the fiscal year ending July 31, 1956. Mr. Kampelman noted particularly that the Association had completed the fiscal year with income exceeding expenditures and that the auditor's report showed the financial affairs of the Association to be in sound condition. The Business Meeting voted unanimous approval of the Treasurer's report.

Mr. Lippincott, Chairman of the Nominating Committee, gave a brief report on the work of the Committee, He then presented the Committee's unanimous nominations for the offices of the Association for 1956–57, as previously reported to the Council (for the names, see the Council Minutes). The Business Meeting voted unanimous approval of the Committee's slate.

The President asked the new President Elect, Mr. Key, to come to the platform, and then turned the gavel over to the incoming President, Mr. Schattschneider.

President Schattschneider adjourned the Business Meeting at 5:45 P.M.

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Regional and Topical

The annual meeting of the Iowa Conference of Political Scientists was held on the campus of Grinnell College on April 28, 1956. The peaker for the morning session was President Charles J. Turck of Macalester College who spoke on the "Aims and Achievements of UNESCO." The speaker at the noon luncheon was Clark M. Eichelberger, executive director of the American Association for the United Nations, who spoke on the subject of "Great

Issues Facing the United Nations." The afternoon session heard state senators William C. Molison of Grinnell and George E. O'Malley of Des Moines speak on the "Issues Before the Iowa 57th General Assembly." Kirk Porter of the State University of Iowa was elected president. George B. Telford of Drake University was reelected secretary.

The 14th Annual Institute on World Affairs was held at San Diego State College, August 6–24, under the direction of professors Minos D. Generales and Ned V. Joy. The theme was "20th Century Realities in International Relations—New Dimensions in the Quest for Peace."

Among the speakers who appeared were: Currin Vance Shields, professor of political science, University of California at Los Angeles; James Avery Joyce, British author, barrister, economist, and educator; C. Easton Rothwell, director, The Hoover Library on War, Revolution and Peace; Kenneth T. Young, director, Office of Southeast Asian Affairs, United States Department of State; Benton W. Decker, R. Adm., Ret., U.S.N.; Albert Hutler, executive director, United Jewish Fund of San Diego; Robert Neumann, professor of political science, University of California at Los Angeles; Richard Richards, Democratic candidate for United States senator from California; L. Vincent Padgett, assistant professor of political science, San Diego State College; and diplomatic representatives from Iran, Indonesia, Belgium, Iraq, Israel, Greece, Turkey, Great Britain, France, Japan, Germany and India.

The 23rd Congress of the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning, held in Vienna, July 22 to 28, drew more than 900 registered participants from 36 countries. The theme of the Congress was "The City and its Surroundings."

Exhibits based on the Congress' theme were shown by 21 countries. The Puerto Rican Planning Board and Massachusetts Institute of Technology represented the U.S.

The International Challenge Cup for films, offered by the City of Vienna, was won by "It Can Be Done," prepared by the University of Pennsylvania for the International Cooperation Administration.

It was voted to hold the 25th Congress in Puerto Rico in 1960, on invitation of Rafael Pico, Secretary of the Treasury of the Commonwealth. This will be the first Congress in the western hemisphere since 1938. The 24th Congress will be in Liège, Belgium, in 1958, the theme being "Regional Man."

Erik Rolfsen, town planner of Oslo, was reelected president. Dennis O'Harrow of the American Society of Planning Officials was re-elected to the executive committee; Candido Oliveras, chairman of the Puerto Rico Planning Board, was elected to succeed Rafael Pico.

Pi Sigma Alpha, national political science honor society (81 chapters), held its biennial convention in Washington on September 6. Officers elected are: Franklin L. Burdette, University of Maryland, president; Cullen B. Gosnell, Emory University, vice president; and Don L. Bowen, American Society for Public Administration, secretary-treasurer. Members of the executive committee elected are: Mona Fletcher, Kent State University; Charles W. Shull, Wayne University and Rita W. Nealon, New York University. The Annual Essay Contest prize of $100 was awarded to Gertrud H. Bauer of American University.

The District of Columbia Political Science Association (DCPSA) held its fifth meeting of the current year in the Hall of Government, George Washington University, October 8, 1956. "The Place of Polls and Election Forecasts in Political Campaigns" was the topic; the panel consisted of Stuart A. Rice, Economic Consultant; Floyd E. McCaffree, Director of Research, Republican National Committee; John Sharon, Assistant to Gov. Stevenson; Louis H. Bean, author of *How to Predict Elections.*

The Woodrow Wilson Department of Foreign Affairs at the University of Virginia held a conference on "The Principle of Self-determination in the Modern World" as part of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration on November 29 and 30, 1956. Scheduled speakers included Philip Jessup and Vernon McKay.

The Graduate School of Boston University has begun a new program of graduate study and research on the metropolitan community.

The department of political science at the University of California, Berkeley, has established an undergraduate honors program designed to provide for superior students some of the advantages of the small liberal arts colleges without sacrificing the special resources of the university. The first group of honors students is under the direction of Victor Jones and G. Leslie McConnell.

A School of International Studies has been started in New Delhi, affiliated with the University of Delhi. It will prepare students for the Ph.D. degree either of the Delhi University or of any other university in the world.

The School specializes in the following areas:

(a) East Asian History and Institutions (covering China, Japan and Korea).
(b) Southeast Asian History and Institutions (covering countries from Burma to Philippines).
(c) South Asia (India, Pakistan, Nepal and Ceylon).
(d) West Asian History and Institutions (Afghanistan to Israel as well as Arab-Africa).
(e) American History and Institutions.
(f) International Economics.

Fuller information may be obtained from Dr. A. Appadorai, Director, I.S.I.S., Sapru House, Barakhamba Road, New Delhi.

A new periodical, the *Free World Review*, P.O. Box 1254, New York 8, New York, has recently published its first issue. According to the editors, Stephen Sisu and Z. Michael Szaz, its aim is "to contribute to the understanding of the complex issues of international politics by emphasizing the need for unity among free nations, and the need for the preservation of Christian and humanist traditions against the challenge of Communist totalitarianism."

The Field Politics Center at Goucher College, aided by a grant from the Maurice and Laura Falk Foundation, is expanding its research function into the peripheral areas of campaign politics, examining the use and effect of campaign gadgetry, songs, and slogans in 19th and 20th century America.

Funds have been made available to facilitate the travel of American specialists in the Soviet and East Central European fields to the area of their professional interest. Limited travel grants will be made for the purpose of strengthening the core of fully-trained, linguistically competent Soviet and East Central European specialists now teaching in universities and colleges throughout the United States and Canada. Scholars interested in traveling to the area of their specialization should apply as soon as possible to Professor William B. Edgerton, chairman of the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants, 429 West 117th Street, New York 27, New York.

The Ford Foundation has made a five year grant of $975,000 to the Citizenship Clearing House, affiliated with the Law Center of New York University, to support a program of encouraging active participation by college men and women in the party of their choice. The bulk of the grant will be expended through the 24 state and regional affiliates located at leading colleges and universities throughout the country. George H. Williams of the law faculty of New York University is director of the Clearing House. Rhoten A. Smith of the University of Kansas served as associate director during 1955–1956, and Professor Ivan Hinderaker of the University of California at Los Angeles will serve as associate director during 1956–1957.

The Soviet Bloc Foreign Economic Relations Project has recently been established in the Woodrow Wilson Department of Foreign Affairs of the University of Virginia. Robert Loring Allen, associate professor in economics, will direct the project. Foreign economic policies and activities of Soviet Bloc countries will be subjected to scrutiny; Soviet aid programs in underdeveloped countries, Burmese-Soviet barter agreements, Iceland's trade agreements with the Soviet Union and other Bloc countries, and other such widely varied activities are to be investigated. A grant from the Dearborn Foundation of Chicago has made this project possible. It will be administered by S. Walter Washington, lecturer in the foreign affairs department of the university.

At its last annual meeting, the Midwest Conference of Political Scientists voted to publish a quarterly review of political science. Final plans were made by the executive council of the conference at its meeting in Washington in early September. The publication will be known as the *Midwest Journal of Political Science*. It will be a quarterly, with the first issue appearing May 1, 1957. The editor will be David Fellman, University of Wisconsin; the managing editor, in charge of business affairs, will be Charles W. Shull, Wayne State University; C. Herman Pritchett, University of Chicago, will serve as book review editor. The following will serve on the editorial board: Samuel J. Eldersveld, University of Michigan; Louis C. Kesselman, University of Louisville; Glendon A. Schubert, Michigan State University; Mulford Q. Sibley, University of Minnesota; Edward H. Buehrig, University of Indiana. The *Journal* will be published by the Wayne State University Press, Detroit. All business inquiries should be addressed to Professor Shull of Wayne State University. The *Journal* will be a general political science review, open to all areas of the discipline and to all members of the profession. Manuscripts should be sent to Professor Fellman at 203 South Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison 6, Wisconsin.

Chadwick F. Alger, now a Proctor fellow at Princeton University, will join the staff of the Swarthmore College political science department as instructor in political science for the second semester of the current year.

John A. Armstrong, Jr., assistant professor, University of Wisconsin, spent the latter part of the summer in the Soviet Union under an award from the Inter-University Committee on Travel Grants. During the second semester of 1956–1957, he will act as visiting assistant professor in the Russian Institute at Columbia University.

Erwin W. Bard, while on sabbatical leave as professor of political science at Brooklyn College, is visiting lecturer at the College of Europe at Bruges. He attended the International Congress of Administrative Sciences in Madrid in September.

Paul C. Bartholomew, professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame, has returned to the campus after serving as a consultant for the Navy Department in Washington during the past summer.

Burton Brazil, assistant professor of political science at San Jose State College, led the ticket for City Council at a recent election at which the City of Saratoga was incorporated.

James Robert Brown, visiting lecturer at Wesleyan University, has accepted an appointment as associate professor at St. Joseph's College, Hartford, for the coming year.

John Cotton Brown, assistant professor of political science and public administration at Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa, spent last summer in England where he was awarded grants by the British and his own college to participate in a seminar on problems of international organization at St. Anthony's College, Oxford.

Henry C. Bush, formerly of Hunter College, was visiting assistant professor at Wayne State University during the summer of 1956 During the year 1956–57 he will direct a 1 month program of training in the field of loca government administration, a program sponsored by the International Cooperation Administration for a group of government officials of the Republic of Indonesia, at Wayne State University.

E. Glenn Callen of Nebraska Wesleyan University has been selected as a member of the Charter Revision Commission of the city of Lincoln.

Earl C. Campbell of San Jose State College taught courses in public administration this summer at the University of Southern California Civic Center Division.

George Catlin, McGill University, has been elected a Fellow of the Royal Society of Literature, London.

David T. Cattell, University of California (Los Angeles), spent the latter part of the summer in Moscow on an Inter-University Travel Grant. Professor Cattell returned to Los Angeles early in October.

Eugene P. Chase, professor of civil rights at Lafayette College, lectured on American institutions during the summer course in American and English studies in Nice, France, during July and August under the auspices of the University of Aix and the French Fulbright Commission.

Harwood L. Childs, Princeton University, is on leave for the academic year, 1956–57. During the second semester, he will serve as visiting lecturer at the University of Southern California on a lectureship sponsored by the John Randolph Haynes and Dora Haynes Foundation of Los Angeles.

Morris H. Cohen, associate professor of government, has returned to Clark University after a year abroad as Fulbright lecturer at the Municipal University of Amsterdam.

Francis W. Coker is teaching at Vanderbilt University during the winter term, 1957.

E. Lane Davis of the State University of Iowa has been granted a leave of absence for the academic year 1956–57. He has been appointed a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, California.

Paul Dolan, chairman of the department of olitical science at the University of Delaware, s lecturing during the current academic year t the Hochschule fuer Sozialwissenschaften, Wilhelmshaven-Ruestersiel, Germany, under Fulbright grant.

John T. Dorsey, Jr., Michigan State University, has returned from Saigon, Viet-Nam, where he was deputy advisor in charge of the Presidency Program of the MSU Technical Assistance Project. After serving as acting coordinator of the project in East Lansing during the summer, he has resumed teaching duties and is assistant coordinator of the project.

Alex N. Dragnich has returned to Vanderbilt University after a year's leave of absence on a Ford Faculty Fellowship, which he spent mostly at Harvard University. During the summer he took a six weeks' tour of the Soviet Union, coming back by way of West Germany and France.

Leon D. Epstein, of the University of Wisconsin, is to be on leave during the second semester 1956–57 in order to engage in research sponsored by the Social Science Research Council.

David G. Farrelly has returned from a year in Italy as a Fulbright Scholar to resume his duties at the University of California (Los Angeles).

Herman Finer has been appointed a director of the Chicago Regional Port Authority. The nomination was made by Mayor Richard Daley and endorsed by Governor Stratton.

G. James Fleming, associate professor of political science at Morgan State College, has been named by the mayor of Baltimore, Maryland, to the newly created Baltimore Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. This is the first FEPC-type public body below the Mason-Dixon line. Dr. Fleming was regional director of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice, for the states of Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware during World War II.

William Fleming, associate professor of political science and chairman of the department of political science at Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin, spent the summer as visiting professor at Northwestern University.

Peter J. Fliess has returned to Louisiana State University from his sabbatical leave at the University of Frankfurt, Germany.

Edgar S. Furniss, Princeton University, has been a visiting professor at Columbia University during the current winter session.

William Goodman is acting chairman of the department of political science at the University of Tennessee for the academic year of 1956–57, during the absence of Lee S. Greene who is on leave.

Albert Gorvine, on the staff of the University of Ankara, on leave from Brooklyn College, attended the International Congress of Administrative Sciences in Madrid in September.

H. Field Haviland, on leave from Haverford College during the present academic year, is serving as senior staff member in international studies at the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

A. Miller Hillhouse, Cornell University, served as a special fiscal consultant to the Baltimore Urban Renewal Study Board in preparation for their report to the mayor, September, 1956, on the city's redevelopment problems.

Gilbert O. Hourtoule, of Lafayette College, served during the summer as consultant to the Commission on Government Security.

Philip E. Jacob returned to the University of Pennsylvania after a year's leave of absence during which he directed a study for the Edward W. Hazen Foundation on the results of general education in the social sciences.

Gayle K. Lawrence has returned to his teaching duties at Temple University after serving 18 months as director of personnel in the Office of Administration, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Leslie Lipson, professor of political science at the University of California, Berkeley, was visiting professor of government at the University of Hawaii's summer session, 1956.

Herbert McClosky, University of Minnesota, has returned to the university to resume his teaching and research duties, following a one-year fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.

James W. Morley has returned to the East

Asian Institute at Columbia University after a year's absence.

Frederick J. Osborn, British town planner who has been active in the garden city movement, was knighted this year, his name being included on the Queen's Birthday Honors List.

Norman D. Palmer, professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania, participated in the following conferences: The Joint Conference on Indo-American Relations, sponsored by the Indian Council of World Affairs (New Delhi) and the Council on Foreign Relations (New York), at Endicott House, Dedham, Mass., June 13–18, 1956. He also was a member of the seminar on "Leadership and Political Institutions in India" at the University of California (Berkeley), August 12–17, 1956, which was organized in conjunction with the Committee on South Asia of the Association of Asian Studies.

Paul A. Pfretzschner taught local government and administration in the summer session in the University of Buffalo.

James K. Pollock, Murfin professor of political science and chairman of the department of political science at the University of Michigan, has been awarded the Grand Cross of the Order of Merit by the government of the German Federal Republic. The presentation was made by President Theodore Heuss on August 31, 1956, and was in recognition of Professor Pollock's contributions to the strengthening of democratic institutions in Germany.

Benjamin Rivlin, now a Fulbright research fellow in North Africa, attended the International Congress of Administrative Sciences in Madrid in September.

Carl J. Schneider has resumed his teaching duties at the University of Nebraska, following a year spent in Germany as a Fulbright Research Fellow.

Jasper Shannon is serving as visiting professor of political science at the University of Nebraska during the 1956–57 academic year.

Dr. Kalman H. Silvert, associate professor in the department of political science at Tulane University continues on leave of absence with the American Universities Field Staff, and is presently in Chile.

H. Arthur Steiner has returned to the University of California (Los Angeles) after a six month tour of south and southeast Asia which was sponsored in part by the International Educational Exchange Program, Department of State.

James A. Storing returned to Colgate University in September after a year's leave spent in Germany, England and Norway with the Overseas Program of the University of Maryland.

Ronald M. Stout, Colgate University, has been granted a leave of absence for the current year to accept a position as director of the intern program, New York State Department of Civil Service.

Robert W. Tucker of Johns Hopkins University joined the political science department of Swarthmore College on a part-time basis for the current semester to teach the seminar in international politics, law and organization.

William Vatcher, Jr., San Jose State College, was nominated for Congress at the Democratic primary in June, and went on half-time status while conducting his campaign for the November election.

Eric Voegelin, Boyd professor of government at Louisiana State University, is on sabbatical leave for the first semester of the academic year 1956–57. He will give the Loeb Lectures at the University of Frankfurt on "The Law and the Prophets" in November–January.

John C. Wahlke will be on leave from Vanderbilt University during the winter and spring terms, 1957, for field work on the comparative state legislative project, financed by the Social Science Research Council.

George A. Warp has resumed his duties at the University of Minnesota after spending fourteen months as a member of the UN mission at the Brazilian School of Public Administration in Rio de Janeiro.

Belle Zeller, professor of political science at Booklyn College, took part in the Conference on Legislative Services of the Council of State Governments in Seattle in August.

APPOINTMENTS AND STAFF CHANGES

David Apter has been appointed assistant professor of political science at Northwestern University.

Richard G. Axt, study director for institutional research of the National Science Foundation, has been appointed assistant director of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, established by an interstate compact of 11 western states and territories, with offices at the University of Colorado, Boulder.

Richard C. Bain has been promoted to research associate at the Brookings Institution.

Sidney Baldwin has been appointed assistant professor of public administration at the New York University Graduate School of Public Administration and Social Service. He will also serve as administrative assistant in the office of the dean.

William C. Benson, former chairman of the department of political science at St. Olaf College, retired from his teaching and administrative duties last spring.

Frederick T. Bent, formerly assistant professor of political science at Coe College, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, has been appointed assistant professor in the Institute of Local and State Government of the University of Pennsylvania.

During the past summer, Conrad L. Bergendoff, Jr., resigned from his position as assistant professor of political science at St. Olaf College to assume a position with UNICEF.

W. Richard Bigger, San Diego State College, has accepted an appointment as associate professor of political science at the University of California (Los Angeles).

Leonard Binder, who received his Ph.D. from Harvard last June, has accepted an appointment as instructor at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Kenneth O. Bjork has been appointed chairman of the political science department at St. Olaf College.

Harold L. Blostein has become instructor in political science at Washburn University.

Virgil Blum, S. J., formerly of Creighten University, was appointed associate professor of political science at Marquette University, effective September, 1956.

Frank R. Brandenburg, who served during the summer months as consultant to the president, Pennsalt International Corporation, has been appointed an assistant professor in political science, Michigan State University.

Erwin C. Buell has been added to the Baylor University department of political science as an assistant professor.

Franklin L. Burdette, who has been on leave of absence from the University of Maryland for two years to serve as head of the overseas book program and related cultural activities of the U.S. Information Agency, has returned to the University as professor of government and politics and has been appointed director of the Bureau of Governmental Research.

Warren M. Campbell has been named instructor in political science at Colgate University.

James C. Charlesworth has resigned as secretary of administration of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and has resumed his duties as professor of political science at the University of Pennsylvania and as president of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. He will remain as executive director of the Pennsylvania Reorganization Commission.

Inis L. Claude, Jr., formerly of Harvard University, is now associate professor of political science and acting chairman of the department of political science at the University of Delaware.

Samuel DuBois Cook has resigned his position as associate professor of political science at Southern University to become chairman of the department of political science at Atlanta University.

Dean Cresap has been promoted to the rank of professor of political science at San Jose State College.

Claude B. Cross, visiting assistant professor of political science at the University of Idaho, resigned to accept a position with the U.S. Information Agency.

Winston Crouch has assumed the chairmanship of the department of political science at the University of California (Los Angeles). Dr. Crouch remains director of the bureau of governmental research.

John H. Ferguson, who is on leave as professor of political science at the Pennsylvania State University, has been appointed secretary of administration of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. During the past year he has been director of program evaluation in the governor's office.

William Fitzgerald, formerly of Loyola University (Los Angeles), has accepted an appointment as assistant professor of political science at Marquette University.

James J. Flannery, formerly director of the bureau of governmental research, School of Public Administration, Florida State University, Tallahassee, and more recently senior research analyst in the Harrisburg office of the Pennsylvania Economy League, has joined the U. S. Public Health Service.

Edward S. Flash, Jr., has joined the faculty of the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, Cornell University, as director of student affairs and lecturer in public administration.

John L. Fletcher has been appointed assistant dean of the Graduate School at Boston University.

Robert S. Friedman of the University of Maryland has been appointed instructor in government at Louisiana State University.

Richard Frost has been appointed an instructor in the Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University.

Robbins L. Gates, Columbia University, has become an instructor at Trinity College (Hartford).

John S. Gillespie has been promoted to assistant professor of political science at Tulane University.

Thomas V. Gilpatrick has been appointed visiting instructor in political science at the Pennsylvania State University for the year 1956–57.

Edward B. Glick, formerly of the political science department of the University of Florida in Gainesville, has been appointed director of the newly created Department of International Affairs of the American Jewish Congress. The AJC is the United States affiliate of the World Jewish Congress.

Edward M. Goldberg has been appointed an instructor in the political science department at the University of Pennsylvania.

Jack Gourman has been appointed as an instructor in the department of political science at The Immaculate Heart College (Los Angeles) for 1956–57.

Robert C. Hartnett, S. J., formerly editor-in-chief of the national Catholic weekly review, *America* (1948–1955), has been appointed dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Loyola University, Chicago. Father Hartnett resumed teaching political theory in the second semester of 1955–56 at the University of Detroit, where he had headed the new department of political science for five semesters, 1946–48, before taking the position on *America* in New York City.

Mark O. Hatfield resigned from the department of political science at Willamette University to become the Republican candidate for Secretary of State in Oregon. He served two terms in the Oregon House of Representatives and one in the Senate while teaching at Willamette.

Richard Hough, graduate student at UCLA, has accepted a one-year appointment as instructor in government at the University of Redlands. He is replacing Robert Morlan, who is filling a Fulbright appointment at the University of Amsterdam.

Robert Huckshorn, who received his Ph. D. at the State University of Iowa, has accepted an appointment as instructor at the University of California (Los Angeles).

Eric James is teaching American government at Brooklyn College during the year 1956–57.

Thomas P. Jenkin, currently on leave in New York, has been promoted to the rank of professor at the University of California (Los Angeles).

Paul F. Johnston joins the staff of the University of Idaho as assistant professor of political science, executive secretary, Borah Committee.

Thomas E. Joyner, formerly of the University of Tampa, has become field supervisor of the Housing Code Study, Division of Housng, State of New York.

Fred Kort has been promoted to an assistant professorship in the department of government and international relations at the University of Connecticut.

G. Leighton LaFuze has been appointed visiting associate professor of political science at the University of Idaho.

Eleanor T. Linenthal has been appointed a research associate on the staff of the Sloan Institute of Hospital Administration in the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell University.

Edward H. Litchfield has resigned as dean of the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration at Cornell University to assume the chancellorship of the University of Pittsburgh.

Charles A. McCoy, formerly of the bureau of public administration at the University of Virginia, has joined the department of political science at Temple University.

Joyce McLeod, formerly at the University of California (Berkeley), is now an acting instructor at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Charles P. McVicker, Jr., has been appointed an instructor in political science, Yale University.

Gerald Mangone has resigned as associate professor of political science at Swarthmore College to accept a position at Syracuse University.

Beatrice Markey, formerly of the Haynes Foundation, has joined the faculty of San Diego State College.

Henry L. Mason, Tulane University, has been promoted to associate professor of political science.

Douglas H. Mendel, Jr., has been promoted to the rank of assistant professor of political science at the University of California (Los Angeles).

Warner E. Mills, Jr., formerly of the University of Texas, has been appointed assistant professor of government at Beloit College.

Robert Morgan has been made associate professor of political science at the University of Nebraska.

Benjamin Nimer has been appointed assistant professor of political science at Washington and Jefferson College.

Irwin Oder is teaching in the political science department at Brooklyn College during the year 1956–57.

Frank Paddock, professor of political science at Temple University, retired in June, 1956, after 28 years of service at the university.

L. Vincent Padgett has joined the faculty of San Diego State College as an assistant professor.

Wallace Parks recently resigned from the Government Operations Committee of the House of Representatives, where his last assignment was chief counsel of the Government Information Subcommittee, to engage in a study under a grant from the Fund for the Republic.

DeVere Pentony has been appointed to an instructorship in political science at the State University of Iowa for the academic year 1956–57.

Dwynal B. Pettengill has been appointed instructor in the department of political science and associate director of the Field Politics Center at Goucher College.

R. Vance Presthus was appointed associate professor of business administration in the Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, Cornell University. He will also serve as associate editor of the *Administrative Science Quarterly*.

Donato J. Pugliese was appointed an instructor in political science at Temple University for the academic year 1956–1957.

Alan C. Rankin, Cornell University, has accepted an appointment as the assistant to the chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh.

Fred Rathjen has joined the department of government of West Texas State College as an instructor beginning September 1, 1956.

John C. Rensenbrink, who recently completed his doctoral studies at the University of Chicago, has been appointed assistant professor of political science at Coe College.

John P. Roche has been appointed chairman of the department of politics, Brandeis University.

James Roherty, who received his doctorate at the University of Wisconsin in the summer of 1956, accepted an appointment as instructor in political science at Marquette University, beginning September, 1956.

Emil J. Sady, who has recently served on the staff of Public Administration Service as chief consultant to the Alaska Constitutional Convention, has been appointed senior staff member in governmental studies at the Brookings Institution.

Robert G. Scigliano of the political science department at Michigan State University was promoted to the position of assistant professor recently.

John Shannon, who received his degree from Kentucky in August, 1956, has been named instructor in political science at Creighton University.

Theodore L. Shay has been appointed assistant professor of political science at Willamette University.

George Shepherd is teaching in the political science department at Brooklyn College during the year 1956–57.

Foster Sherwood has been promoted to the rank of professor of political science, University of California at Los Angeles.

Currin V. Shields has been promoted to the rank of associate professor of political science at the University of California (Los Angeles).

Robert A. Sigafoos has been appointed assistant executive secretary of the Institute of Local Government at the Pennsylvania Stat University. He was formerly financial consultant to the Secretary of the Treasury, an director of research for the Department of th Treasury of the Commonwealth of Puert Rico.

Edmund F. Spellacy, professor of government, became dean of the College of Genera Studies, University of Hawaii, on Septembe 1, 1956.

Richard F. Staar has been elected to th chairmanship of the social sciences division o Harding College which includes the departments of business and economics, politica science, as well as history, geography an sociology.

Robert J. Steamer of the University o Massachusetts has been appointed assistan professor of government at Louisiana State University.

Harold Stein, who has been with the Twentieth Century Fund, has been appointed visiting lecturer with rank of professor in the Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University.

Loren E. Tesdell was appointed an instructor in political science at Temple University beginning with the fall semester in 1956.

Harold M. Thewlis, formerly of Queens College, has been appointed an instructor at the University of Connecticut.

Earl Warner has been reappointed as chairman of the department of political science at Ohio Wesleyan University for a two-year period ending June, 1958.

IN MEMORIAM

Leslie A. Foust, in July, 1956, died of a heart attack. His experiences were many and varied. He was a teacher and principal in elementary and secondary schools and served in the Infantry in the Argonne and Vosges Mountains engagements of World War I. He received his Bachelor and Master of Science degrees at Washington and Jefferson College, and later his Doctor of Philosophy degree at the University of Pittsburgh. He served as an administrator for Washington and Jefferson through two decades but concluded his career as professor of political science and chairman of that department, respected by both students and colleagues for his scholarship and integrity. He was a member of Delta Sigma Rho, Pi Sigma Alpha, Pennsylvania Political Science and Public Administration Association, and American Political Science Association.

Isidor Loeb, a life member of the Association since 1909, and its President in 1933, died recently at his home in St. Louis.

James E. Pate, professor of political science at William and Mary for more than 25 years, government consultant, scholar and public servant, died June 12 in Williamsburg. He had been ill for several weeks, following an attack of cerebral thrombosis.

Long an expert in the field of local government and planning, Dr. Pate was author of "Local Government and Administration," a widely used college textbook, and of numerous articles in professional journals.

Dr. Pate was appointed to the William and Mary faculty in 1927, and has served as professor of political science since 1930.

Ten years ago Arnaud B. Leavelle was called to Stanford University to be assistant professor of political science. On October 22, 1956, his death came suddenly with a massive coronary thrombosis while he was exercising his polio-crippled limbs. Only 42, Professor Leavelle's life was arrested in mid-career. Born a native of California, he had spent part of his youth in China, where he contracted the polio that incapacitated him for long and ravaged him to the end. He prepared at the University of California, Los Angeles, where he received the bachelor's degree in 1937, the master's in 1939 and the doctorate in 1940. Always an outstanding student, he won undergraduate scholarships and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and as a graduate was made a teaching fellow.

After beginning his professional work at Swarthmore College, which later called him back twice, first from UCLA and then from Illinois, he came to Stanford University, there to remain except for one year as Fulbright Research Professor at Nuffield College, Oxford. Both as a teacher and as a research scholar, Professor Leavelle was primarily interested in the political theory field. An exciting and exacting class-room teacher, he became a general favorite among undergraduates both within and beyond the ranks of political science majors. The current junior class at Stanford has established a perpetual memorial in his honor, the Leavelle Prize in Political Theory, to go to the best student in the introductory course, for which he was famous on campus. He was equally respected by the graduate students, for whom, in most cases, he was the first faculty contact. To himself he gave no quarter; for them, he had an endless patience.

It is a grievous loss to scholarship that Professor Leavelle's career was cut short while his writings were still few. Except for articles in scholarly journals, the sole literary monument he has left is the manuscript of a volume to be posthumously published on the political philosophy of Justice James Wilson, member of the Constitutional Convention and Justice of the Supreme Court. Stanford University recognized Professor Leavelle's signal talent by rapid promotion, to an associate professorship in 1949 and to a professorship in 1954. Even earlier he had acted as executive head of his Department.

He was a devoted member of the American Political Science Association, on whose Executive Council he had served; the American Association of University Professors, of whose Stanford chapter he was a moving spirit; and of the American Civil Liberties Union. At the time of his death he was bibliographical editor in the theory field for this REVIEW, editorial consultant for the *Western Political Quarterly*, and President of the Northern California Political Science Association.—JAMES T. WATKINS, IV

1957 PROGRAM OF CONGRESSIONAL FELLOWSHIPS

Applications for the 1957 program of Congressional Fellowships will close on February 15, 1957. This program which is now in its fourth year of operation, enables young political scientists and journalists to gain the practical experience of working as staff members of Congressional committees and in the offices of House and Senate members. Half of the Fellowships will be awarded to those with graduate training and/or teaching experience in political science and half for journalists or young teachers in schools of journalism (including those active in either radio, television, or on periodicals or newspapers). The stipend for each Fellowship will be $4,500, plus travel expenses to and from Washington, D. C. According to current tax rulings, a large portion of the stipend is tax-free.

The age limit has been lowered somewhat from last year and preference will be given to applicants in the 25–32 age group. It is no longer necessary to submit applications through the Chairman of the department of political science. Any number of applicants may apply directly to The American Political Science Association.

Preference will be given to applicants who have not had the opportunity to work or live in

Washington, D. C. The following types of experience and training are suggestive rather than binding:

(1) Completion of two years' graduate work in political science plus one year of experience in politics, teaching or public administration.

(2) A.B. degree (honor graduate) in political science or journalism with two years of full-time practical experience in newspaper, radio or television work.

The program will commence on November 18, 1957, with a one-month orientation period of intensive readings, seminars and discussions with experts in the legislative process. The last eight months will be divided between staff assignments with Senators, Representatives and Congressional committees. As far as possible, each Fellowship winner will be allowed to choos his preference, commencing with an assignment in the House of Representatives in January, and moving to the Senate in May. Th program will conclude on August 18, 1957.

As this program has developed, the Congressional Fellows have received increasingl responsible assignments on Capitol Hill, handling legislation, speech writing, committe work, constituent inquiries, relations with executive departments, and have in many case been given access to executive sessions of committee meetings and have been given an insid picture of Congress in operation.

Additional information and application form may be obtained from the Association office.

1957 POLITICAL SCIENCE AWARDS FOR STATEHOUSE AND CITY HALL JOURNALISTS

Applications will be accepted through July 1, 1957 for the second series of awards to newspaper men or women in 12 Midwestern states. The awards will be made for the 12 best articles or series of articles on any phase of state or local government or politics, published in any newspaper in the following states: North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Ohio. Eligible will be any newspaper man or woman between the ages of 25 and 35 currently working full time on any daily newspaper in the above states. Articles will be judged on the basis of: Ability to clarify a complex issue; persistence and imaginativeness of research; originality of presentation and quality of writing. Articles will be eligible for the awards if published at any tim from June 1, 1956 to June 1, 1957. Plaques wil be presented to the newspaper publishing th winning articles, and to the individual winners. The winners will also be invited for a all-expense paid, two weeks stay at Allerto Park, Illinois during the period December 1-15, 1957. During these two weeks they will b invited to participate in a conference in publi affairs reporting with leading journalists an political scientists. Application blanks may b secured by writing to the Association.

INDEX TO VOLUME L

cheson, Dean. Books of, reviewed..... 867
denauer, Konrad. Books of, noted.....1192
DMINISTRATIVE LAW. Book notes...... 577
drian, Charles R. Books of, noticed.... 241
FRICA. Liebenow, J. Gus, Jr. Responses to Planned Political Change in a Tanganyika Tribal Group......... 442
  Robinson, Kenneth. A Survey of the Background Material for the Study of Government in French Tropical Africa.......................... 179
  Book notices............251, 260, 580, 590
  Book reviews on: Apter, David. *The Gold Coast in Transition*...........1138
hmad, Mushtaq. Books of, noted...... 907
kzin, Benjamin. Books of, reviewed....1152
LABAMA. Book notes................. 884
  Book notices......................1170
LBANIA. Book notices................1184
lderfer, Harold F. Near East Local Government...................1120
llport, Gordon W. Books of, reviewed.. 541
lmond, Gabriel A. Book reviews....... 512
MERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION.
  Constitutional revision.............. 488
  News and Notes........284, 613, 927, 1219
  Obituaries.................622, 942, 1232
  Presidential address.................
MERICAN POLITICAL THOUGHT. Dean, Howard E. J. Allen Smith: Jeffersonian Critic of the Federalist State.....1093
  Kariel, Henry. The Limits of Social Science: Henry Adams' Quest for Order..........................1074
  Prothro, James W. Verbal Shifts in the American Presidency: A Content Analysis..................... 726
  Book notes........................ 267
  Book notices...270, 552, 553, 917, 918, 1168
  Book reviews on: Acheson, Dean. *A Democrat Looks at His Party*....... 867
  Brown, Robert E. *Charles Beard and the Constitution*..................1154
  Dahl, Robert A. *Preface to Democratic Theory*.....................1134
  Ekirch, Arthur A., Jr. *The Civilian and the Military*.................1156
  —— *The Decline of American Liberalism*............................. 866
  Hofstadter, Richard. *The Age of Reform*........................... 862
  —— and Metzger, Walter P. *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*.................... 527
  MacIver, Robert M. *Academic Freedom in Our Time*................. 527
  Mason, Alpheus Thomas. *Security Through Freedom*................. 525
  Rossiter, Clinton. *Conservatism in America*........................ 864
Anderson, C. David. Books of, reviewed..1164
Apter, David. Books of, reviewed........1138
ARGENTINA. Book notes................1192
Arndt, Christian O. Books of, noticed... 590
Arnett, Ethel Stephens. Books of, noticed. 241
Arnold, G. L. Books of, noticed........ 589
Ascher, Charles S. Book reviews........1152
Aumann, Francis R. Books of, reviewed.1162
AUSTRALIA. Book notices............... 578
  Book reviews on: Birch, A. H. *Federalism, Finance and Social Legislation in Canada, Australia, and the United States*......................... 232
AUSTRIA. Book notices................. 249

Bailey, Stephen K. Books of, reviewed... 544
Baker, Roscoe. Books of, noticed....... 240
Baldwin, George D. Books of, reviewed..1150
Baldwin, Leland Dewitt. Books of, noticed......................... 241
Ball, W. Macmahon. Books of, noticed...
Barber, Elinor G. Books of, noticed....1208
Barbu, Zeuedei. Books of, noticed......1208
Barker, Sir Ernest. Books of, noticed..... 579
Barnes, Hazel E. Books of, noticed......1207
Bartholomew, Harland. Books of, noticed 241
Bartley, Ernest R. Books of, noticed..... 242
Basu, Durga Das. Books of, noticed..... 578
Battistini, Lawrence H. Books of, noticed 589
Baude, Annika. Swedish Local Government..........................1115
Beard, Mary Ritter. Books of, noticed.. 552
Beer, Samuel H. Pressure Groups and Parties in Britain................. 1
  —— Books of, noticed.............. 270
Beisel, Albert R., Jr. Books of, reviewed.. 877
Bell, Daniel. Books of, noticed.......... 918
Beloff, Max. Book reviews............. 851
  —— Books of, reviewed............ 538
Bender, Alexander. Books of, noticed.... 579
Benedict, Murray R. Books of, noticed.. 552
Berlin, Isaiah. Books of, noted......... 598
Bernstein, Irving. Books of, noticed..... 241
Bernstein, Samuel. Books of, noticed.... 271
Bhaskaran, R. Local Government in India..........................1123
BIBLIOGRAPHY. Burdette, Franklin L. Articles and Documents on American

Government and Politics.........242, 569, 890, 1172
Leavelle, Arnaud B. Articles and Documents on Political Theory.........919, 1209
Roberts, William H. Articles and Documents on Foreign and Comparative Government..............251, 580
—— Articles and Documents on International Law and Relations........260, 590, 909, 1195
Robinson, Kenneth. A Survey of the Background Material for the Study of Government in French Tropical Africa.......................... 179
Seyler, William C. Doctoral Dissertations in Political Science........... 807
Simon, Herbert A. Articles and Documents on Methodology and Research in the Social Sciences........279, 607, 923, 1215
Stout, Hiram M. Articles and Documents on Foreign and Comparative Government.................901, 1184
Wilson, Francis G. Articles and Documents on Political Theory..271, 601
Zink, Harold. Slected Materials for A Comparative Study of Local Government.............................1107
Book notices......................240, 259, 260, 269, 578, 580, 917, 918, 1183
BIOGRAPHY. Book notes.................599, 897, 1168, 1192, 1203
Book notices.....................240, 241, 242, 550, 552, 553, 918, 1170, 1208
Book reviews on: Buehrig, Edward H. *Woodrow Wilson and the Balance of Power*.......................... 547
Birch, A. H. Books of, reviewed......... 232
Blake, Nelson Manfred. Books of, noted. 886
Blake, Robert. Books of, noted.......... 897
Blitzer, Charles. Books of, noticed...... 271
Bodin, Jean. Books of, noticed.......... 917
Bone, Hugh A. An Introduction to the Senate Policy Committees......... 339
Borton, Hugh. Books of, noticed.....248, 258
Bracher, Karl Dietrich. Books of, reviewed............................ 533
Braibanti, Ralph. Book reviews.......... 876
Breitling, Rupert. Books of, noted...... 898
Bretton, Henry L. Book notes........... 246
—— Books of, reviewed............ 534
Briggs, Asa. Books of, noticed.......... 249
Brinton, Crane. Book notes............ 598
Brower, Frank E. Books of, noticed..... 270
Brown, Robert E. Books of, reviewed..........................1153, 1154
Brownlow, Louis. Books of, noticed..... 55
Bruner, Jerome S. Books of, noticed.... 91
Brzezinski, Zbigniew K. Totalitariansim and Rationality................. 75
—— Books of, reviewed............. 87
Buehrig, Edward H. Book notes........119
—— Books of, reviewed............. 54
BULGARIA. Book notices..................118
Burch, Philip H., Jr. and Rich, Bennett M. The Changing Role of the National Guard................... 70
Burdette, Franklin L. Articles and Documents on American Government and Politics..............242, 569, 890, 117
Burdine, J. Alton. Book notes.......... 26
BURMA. Book reviews on: Emerson, Rupert. *Representative Government in Southeast Asia*.................. 50
Burnham, W. Dean. Books of, noticed .. 24
Butler, D. E. Books of, noticed......... 57
Butler, Rohan. Books of, noticed....588, 58
Butters, J. Keith. Books of, noted...... 88
Butz, Otto. Books of, noticed...........120
Byé, Maurice. Books of, reviewed....... 51

Caldwell, Lynton K. Books of, reviewed.116
Calkins, Howard A. Book notes........ 54
Calvocoressi, Peter. Books of, noticed...119
Campion, Lord. Books of, noticed...... 58
CANADA. Musolf, Lloyd D. Canadian Public Enterprise: A Character Study.......................... 40
Book notices...................579, 118
Book reviews on: Birch, A. H. *Federalism, Finance and Social Legislation in Canada, Australia, and the United States*........................ 23
Mallory, J. R. *Social Credit and the Federal Power in Canada*........... 23
Williams, John R. *The Conservative Party of Canada, 1920–1949*........114
Cannarsa, Spartaco. Books of, noticed... 25
CARIBBEAN. Book reviews on: *Development Toward Self-Government in the Caribbean: A Symposium*............... 85
Carson, George Barr, Jr. Books of, noticed............................ 25
Carter, Gwendolen M. Book notes......118
Chamberlin, Waldo. Books of, noticed... 25
Chapman, Brian. French Local Government.............................110
—— Italian Local Government.......111
Chapman, John W. Book notes......... 59
Chatham House Study Group. Books of, noticed.......................... 59
Cheever, Daniel S. Book reviews....... 85
CHINA. Book notices................... 90

Book reviews on: Lindsay, Michael. *China and the Cold War* 514
hinoy, Ely. Books of, reviewed 235
hristol, Carl Q. Book reviews 234
hung, Kyung Cho. Books of, noticed 580
laude, Inis L., Jr. Book notes 587
—— Books of, reviewed 222
ohn, David L. Books of, noticed 1170
ole, Henry B. Books of, noticed 579
ole, K. C. Book reviews 525
oleman, James S. Book reviews 1138
olm, Gerhard. Books of, reviewed 847
LONIES AND DEPENDENCIES. Liebenow, J. Gus, Jr. Responses to Planned Political Change in a Tanganyika Tribal Group 442
Robinson, Kenneth. A Survey of Background Material for the Study of Government in French Tropical Africa 179
Book notices 580
Book reviews on: Apter, David. *The Gold Coast in Transition* 1138
Development Toward Self-Government in the Caribbean: A Symposium 858
ommittee for German Unity (Berlin). Books of, noticed 1183
MMUNISM. Godfrey, E. Drexel, Jr. The Communist Presence in France 321
Kenney, Charles D. The Twentieth C.P.S.U. Congress: A Study in Calculated Moderation 764
Book notes 247, 268
Book notices 249, 901, 1184, 1194
Book reviews on: Brzezinski, Zbigniew K. *The Permanent Purge* 872
Stouffer, Samuel A. *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties* 223
MPARATIVE GOVERNMENT. Beer, Samuel H. Pressure Groups and Parties in Britain 1
Brzezinski, Zbigniew. Totalitarianism and Rationality 751
Lott, Leo B. Executive Power in Venezuela 422
Macridis, Roy. A Note on the Revision of the Constitution of the Fourth Republic 1011
Ward, Robert E. The Origins of the Present Japanese Constitution 980
Articles and documents . . 251, 580, 901, 1184
Book notes 1180, 1190
Book notices 577, 578, 580, 889, 900, 901, 1184, 1194
Book reviews on: Birch, A. H. *Federalism, Finance and Social Legislation in Canada, Australia, and the United States* 232
Bracher, Karl Dietrich. *Die Auflösung der Weimarer Republik* 533
Kelsall, R. K. *Higher Civil Servants in Britain* 229
McKenzie, R. T. *British Political Parties* 227
Mallory, J. R. *Social Credit and the Federal Power in Canada* 230
Quigley, Harold S. and Turner, John E. *The New Japan* 876
Rustow, Dankwart. A. *The Politics of Compromise* 1149
Williams, John R. *The Conservative Party of Canada, 1920–1949* 1146
CONSTITUTIONAL LAW. Fellman, David. Constitutional Law in 1954–1955 43
Huntington, Samuel P. Civilian Control and the Constitution 676
Book notes 549, 1168, 1190
Book notices 240, 241
Book reviews on: Beisel, Albert R. Jr. *Control over Illegal Enforcement of the Criminal Law* 877
Cookenboo, Leslie, Jr. Books of, noted . . 239
Cooper, James Fenimore. Books of, noticed 918
Corson, John J. Books of, noticed 552
Corwin, Edward S. Books of, reviewed . . 880
Costanzo, Joseph F. Book notes 1205
Cottrell, Fred. Books of, noted 1204
Coulborn, Rushton. Books of, reviewed . 1136
Craig, Gordon A. Books of, noted 246
CUBA. Book notices 251
Cuninggim, Merrimon. Books of, noticed 270
Curl, Peter V. Books of, noticed 259
Current, Richard N. Books of, noticed . . 241
Cushman, Robert Fairchild. Book reviews 877

D'Addio, Mario. Books of, reviewed 869
Dahl, Robert A. Book reviews 860
—— Books of, reviewed 544, 1134
Daland, Robert T. Book notes 886
—— Books of, noted 884
Dallin, David J. Books of, reviewed 1147
Dauer, Manning J. Books of, noticed 551
—— Stephenson, William A. F.; Macy, Harry; and Temple, David. Toward A Model State Presidential Primary Law 138
David, Paul T. Books of, reviewed 544
Davies, James C. Book reviews 1144
Davis, Thurston N. Books of, notices 1208
Dean, Howard E. J. Allen Smith: Jeffersonian Critic of the Federalist State . 1093
Deane, Herbert A. Books of, reviewed . . . 522

De Enterria, Eduardo García. Books of, noted........................... 577
Degras, Jane. Books of, noticed........1194
De Grazia, Alfred. Books of, reviewed... 544
De Jong, Louis. Books of, noted........1191
DENMARK. Holm, Alex. Danish Local Government........................1117
Dewar, Margaret. Books of, reviewed...1147
Dill, Alonzo Thomas. Books of, noticed.. 241
Dimock, Marshall E. The Administrative Staff College: Executive Development in Government and Industry.. 166
Dinerstein, Herbert S. Books of, noted.. 247
Dondo, Mathurin. Books of, noticed.... 917
Douglass, Elisha P. Books of, noted..... 267
Doyle, Wilson K. Books of, reviewed....1164
Drummond, Donald F. Books of, noticed 260
Duverger, Maurice. Books of, noted.....1181

Eagelton, Clyde. Books of, noticed...... 259
Earle, Valerie A. Book notes........... 884
EAST GERMANY. Book notices........... 250
Ebenstein, William. Book notes........ 268
—— Book reviews.................. 199
Eckstein, Harry (Rapporteur). Political Theory and the Study of Politics: A Report of a Conference 475
ECONOMIC PROBLEMS. Book notices...... 552
ECONOMICS. Book notes........239, 887, 1204
Book notices...................... 240
Book reviews on: Smithies, Arthur, *et al. Economics and Public Policy: Brookings Lectures, 1954*........... 860
Ehrmann, Henry W. Book reviews...... 519
Einaudi, Mario. Book reviews.......... 869
—— Books of, reviewed............. 519
Ekirch, Arthur A., Jr. Books of, reviewed 866, 1156
Eldersveld, Samuel J. Experimental Propaganda Techniques and Voting Behavior.......................... 154
ELECTIONS. Dauer, Manning J., *et al.* Toward a Model State Presidential Primary Law...................... 138
Eldersveld, Samuel J. Experimental Propaganda Techniques and Voting Behavior....................... 154
Harrison, Selig S. Caste and the Andhra Communists............. 378
Book notices.......241, 250, 579, 580, 1170
Book reviews on: Ross, J. F. S. *Elections and Electors*.....................1166
Scammon, Richard M. *America Votes—A Handbook of Contemporary American Election Statistics*.............1141
Thomson, Charles A. H. *Television and Presidential Politics*........... 882
Emden, Cecil S. Books of, noticed......118
Emerson, Rupert. Book reviews........ 21
—— Books of, reviewed............. 50
Enarson, Harold L. Books of, noticed... 24
Engelbert, Ernest A. Book notes........120
Engels, Friedrich. Books of, noticed..... 27
Epstein, Leon D. Cohesion of British Parliamentary Parties............. 36
Esslinger, William. Books of, noticed.... 27
ETHIOPIA. Book notices............... 25
EUROPE. Book notes.................. 90
Book notices..............248, 590, 119
Everett, Samuel. Books of, noticed...... 59
Ewart, Lewis. The Contribution of Medieval Thought to the American Political Tradition.................... 46
Eysenck, H. J. Books of, noted......... 59

FAR EAST. Book notices........589, 901, 118
Book reviews on: Emerson, Rupert. *Representative Government in Southeast Asia*........................ 50
Li, Tieh-tseng. *The Historical Status of Tibet*..........................116
Lindsay, Michael. *China and the Cold War*........................... 51
Rostow, W. W. and Hatch, Richard W. *An American Policy in Asia*.... 22
Vinacke, Harold M. *Far Eastern Politics in the Postwar Period*.......115
Farmer, Hallie. Book notes............ 23
FEDERALISM. Huntington, Samuel P. Civilian Control and the Constitution. 67
Book notes.....................885, 90
Book notices...................248, 88
Book reviews on: Birch, A. H. *Federalism, Finance and Social Legislation in Canada, Australia, and the United States*.......................... 23
Mallory, J. R. *Social Credit and the Federal Power in Canada*.......... 23
The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: A Report to the President for Transmittal to the Congress......... 20
Fellman, David. *Constitutional Law in 1954–1955*...................... 4
—— Book reviews..................116
Fenn, P. T. Book notes.................116
Field, G. Lowell. Book notes...........118
Filley, Walter O. Book reviews.........114
Fitzgibbon, Russell H. Book notes......119
Flanders, Ralph E. Books of, noticed....117
Fleming, R. W. Books of, noticed....... 24
Fliess, Peter J. Books of, noted......... 89
Flom, Floyd O. Books of, noticed....... 55
FLORIDA. Book reviews on: Doyle, Wilson K., Laird, Angus M. and Weiss, S.

Sherman. *The Government and Administration of Florida*............1164
orinsky, Michael T. Books of, noticed.. 248
lliot, Denise. Books of, noticed.......1193
rdham, Jefferson B. Books of, noticed. 918
rtenberry, Charles N. Books of, reviewed.........................1164
sfeld, Daniel R. Books of, noticed.... 552
ANCE. Chapman, Brian. French Local Government.....................1108
Godfrey, E. Drexel, Jr. The Communist Presence in France......... 321
Macridis, Roy. A Note on the Revision of the Constitution of the Fourth Republic.........................1011
Book reviews on: Einaudi, Mario, Byé, Maurice, and Rossi, Ernesto. *Nationalization in France and Italy*.... 519
ank, Joseph. Books of, noticed....... 271
eydig, Constance A. Books of, noticed. 578
iedrich, Carl J. Book reviews.........1136
rniss, Edgar S., Jr. Book reviews..... 538
—— Books of, noticed.............. 259

able, Richard W. Books of, noticed....1171
alloway, George B. Book reviews...... 520
arceau, Oliver. Book reviews.......... 867
OGRAPHY. Book notices..............1208
ORGIA. Book reviews on: Gosnell, Cullen B. and Anderson, C. David. *The Government and Administration of Georgia*.........................1164
RMANY. Wells, Roger H. German State and Local Government............1112
Book notes.......246, 898, 899, 1191, 1192
Book notices....................... 249, 250, 269, 589, 899, 900, 917, 1183, 1207
Book reviews on: Bracher, Karl Dietrich. *Die Auflösung der Weimarer Republik*......................... 533
Kohn, Hans (ed.). *German History*.. 543
Pollock, James K.; Bretton, Henry L.; Grace, Frank; and McHargue, Daniel S. *German Democracy at Work* 534
eyl, C. M. Books of, noted...........1191
ladden, E. N. Books of, reviewed...... 874
lum, Friedrich. Books of, noticed...... 269
odfrey, E. Drexel, Jr. The Communist Presence in France................ 321
oodman, William. Books of, noticed...1171
oodrich, Leland M. Book notes....... 587
—— Books of, reviewed............. 218
osnell, Cullen B. Books of, reviewed...1164
ouré, Leon. Books of, noted.......... 247
race, Frank. Books of, reviewed....... 534
REAT BRITAIN. Epstein, Leon D. Cohesion of British Parliamentary Parties 360
Book notes....................576, 897
Book notices....................... ....249, 250, 579, 588, 589, 900, 1182
Book reviews on: Baldwin, George D. *Beyond Nationalization*............1150
Kelsall, R. K. *Higher Civil Servants in Britain*.......................... 229
McKenzie, R. T. *British Political Parties*.......................... 227
Ross, J. F. S. *Elections and Electors*..1166
Spero, Sterling D. *Labor Relations in British Nationalized Industry*.......1150
Green, F. C. Books of, noted........... 599
Green, James Frederick. Books of, noted.1193
Greenwood, Gordon. Books of, noticed.. 578
Griffith, Ernest S. Books of, noticed..... 550
——, Plamenatz, John, and Pennock, J. Roland. Cultural Prerequisites to a Successfully Functioning Democracy: A Symposium............... 101
Grinsel, Carl W. Books of, notices......1207
Gross, Bertram M. Book reviews....... 536
Grosser, Alfred. Books of, noticed....... 249
Gruber, Karl. Books of, noticed........ 249
GUATEMALA. Taylor, Philip B., Jr. The Guatemalan Affair: A Critique of United States Foreign Policy....... 787
Gulick, Charles A. Books of, noticed.... 580
Gulick, Edward Vose. Books of, noted..1190

Haas, Ernst B. Books of, noticed....... 588
Haimson, Leopold H. Books of, noticed.. 249
Hall, H. Duncan. Books of, noticed..... 249
Hammond, Paul Y. Book reviews.......1156
Handlin, Oscar. Books of, noticed....241, 242
Hanson, A. H. Books of, noticed........1181
Harbold, William H. Book notes........ 905
Hardin, Charles M. Book reviews...541, 1143
Harris, John S. Books of, noticed.......1182
Harrison, Selig. S. Caste and the Andhra Communists.................... 378
Hatch, Richard W. Books of, reviewed.. 225
Havard, William C. Books of, noticed... 551
Haviland, H. Field, Jr. Book notes...... 258
Heard, Alexander. Book reviews........1141
Heimann, Eduard. Books of, reviewed... 532
Hendry, James McLeod. Books of, noted.1190
Henry, Roberts L. Books of, noticed.... 259
Herz, John H. Book reviews........... 533
Hicks, John D. Books of, noticed....... 241
Highsaw, Robert B. Books of, reviewed..1164
Hill, Norman. Book notes.............1191
—— Book reviews................. 218
Hinderaker, Ivan. Books of, noticed.....1171
HISTORY. Book notes.................. 237, 246, 267, 598, 885, 1190, 1191, 1203, 1204

Book notices........................241, 242, 248, 249, 250, 258, 259, 260, 271, 552, 579, 888, 889, 900, 917, 1182, 1183, 1194, 1208
Book reviews on: Brown, Robert E. *Charles Beard and the Constitution*...1154
—— *Middle-Class Democracy and the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691–1780*.............................1153
Coulborn, Rushton (ed.). *Feudalism in History*.............................1136
Hofstadter, Richard. *The Age of Reform*........................... 862
—— and Metzger, Walter P. *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*.................. 527
Kohn, Hans (ed.). *German History*.. 543
Li, Tieh-tseng. *The Historical Status of Tibet*.........................1161
Hofstadter, Richard. Books of, reviewed. 527, 862
Hogan, Willard N. Books of, noted..... 258
Holm, Alex. Danish Local Government..1117
Hook, Sidney. Books of, noticed........ 270
Horne, Alistair. Books of, noticed.......1183
Hounshell, Charles D. Book notes......1192
Howarth, Patrick. Books of, noticed.... 579
Huitt, Ralph K. Book notes........... 239
Hunt, Elgin F. Books of, noticed....... 271
Hunt, R. N. Carew. Books of, reviewed.. 199
Hunter, Floyd. Book notes............. 268
Huntington, Samuel P. Civilian Control and the Constitution.............. 676
—— Book reviews.................. 878

ICELAND. Book notces................. 251
INDIA. Bhaskaran, R. Local Government in India.........................1123
Harrison, Selig S. Caste and the Andhra Communists.............. 378
Book notes....................906, 1205
Book notices......578, 589, 908, 1184, 1208
INDONESIA. Book notices............248, 578
Book reviews on: Emerson, Rupert. *Representative Government in Southeast Asia*....................... 505
Book reviews on: Schiller, A. Arthur. *The Formation of Federal Indonesia, 1945–1949*...................... 505
Informationsburo West (Berlin—Schlachtensee). Books of, noticed.......... 250
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND ORGANIZATION. Book notes.......258, 1192
Book notices.....260, 589, 1170, 1182, 1208
Book reviews on: Akzin, Benjamin. *New States and International Organizations*.........................1152
Price, Harry Bayard, Jr. *The Marshall Plan and its Meaning*......... 5
Wilcox, Francis O. and Marcy, Carl M. *Proposals for Changes in the United Nations*.................. 8
INTERNATIONAL LAW. Articles and documents...............260, 590, 909, 11
Book notes....................... 5
Book notices....................260, 11
Book reviews on: Khadduri, Majid. *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*.. 8
—— and Liebesny, Herbert J. (eds.). *Law in the Middle East. Volume I*... 8
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. Articles and documents...........260, 590, 909, 11
Book notes............258, 905, 906, 11
Book notices...................258, 25 260, 577, 588, 589, 590, 901, 908, 11
Book reviews on: Claude, Inis L., Jr. *National Minorities*............... 2
Goodrich, Leland M. and Simons, Anne P. *The United Nations and the Maintenance of International Peace and Security*..................... 2
Jones, Joseph M. *The Fifteen Weeks (February 21–June 5, 1947)*........ 5
Lattimore, Owen. *Nationalism and Revolution in Mongolia*............ 8
Lindsay, Michael. *China and the Cold War*........................... 5
Vinacke, Harold M. *Far Eastern Politics in the Postwar Period*.......11
Wright, Quincy. *The Study of International Relations*............... 2
IRELAND. Book notices............900, 11
ISLAM. Book notices.................. 5
ISRAEL. Book reviews on: Rackman, Emanuel. *Israel's Emerging Constitution, 1948–51*.................. 5
ITALY. Chapman, Brian. Italian Local Government.....................11
Book notices................250, 900, 9
Book reviews on: Einaudi, Mario, Byé, Maurice, and Rossi, Ernesto. *Nationalization in France and Italy*.... 5

Jackson, Robert H. Books of, noticed... 5
Jaffa, Harry V. Book reviews.......... 5
JAPAN. Steiner, Kurt. Japanese Local Government...................11
Ward, Robert E. The Origins of the Present Japanese Constitution.......9
Book notices...................248, 5
Book reviews on: Quigley, Harold S. and Turner, John E. *The New Japan* 8
Jeffries, Sir Charles. Books of, noticed..11
Jenkin, Thomas P. Books of, noticed.... 2
Jewkes, John. Books of, reviewed....... 8

nes, F. C. Books of, noticed.......... 258
nes, Joseph M. Books of, reviewed.... 509
nes, W. Melville. Books of, noted.....1168
hnson, Arthur Menzies. Books of, noticed..........................1171
hnson, Claudius O. Books of, noticed.............................240, 551
y, Admiral C. Turner. Books of, noticed 590
DICIARY. Book notices............... 550
Book reviews on: Mayers, Lewis. *The American Legal System*............ 234

abir, Humayun. Books of, noticed..... 918
ahin, George McT. Book reviews...... 505
—— Books of, noticed.............. 590
allenbach, Joseph E. Book notes......1169
—— Book reviews.................. 880
ariel, Henry. The Limits of Social Science: Henry Adams' Quest for Order.............................1074
arsch, Robert F. Books of, noticed.... 551
atz, Elihu. Books of, noticed......... 918
aufman, Herbert. Emerging Conflicts in the Doctrines of Public Administration.........................1057
—— Book reviews.................. 874
aufmann, William W. Books of, reviewed.......................... 878
eith-Lucas, Alan. Book notes......... 238
elsall, R. K. Books of, reviewed........ 229
elsen, Hans. Books of, noted.......... 268
endall, Willmoore. Books of, noticed...1170
ennedy, John F. Books of, noticed..... 553
enney, Charles D. The Twentieth C.P.S.U. Congress: A Study in Calculated Moderation............... 764
enyon, Cecelia M. Book reviews..866, 1153
ey, V. O., Jr. Books of, reviewed......1143
hadduri, Majid. Books of, reviewed... 854
ilmer, Kenton. Books of, noticed...... 550
lain, Maurice. Book reviews..........1154
night, Frank H. Books of, reviewed... 860
ochan, Lionel. Books of, noticed...... 249
oenig, Louis W. Books of, reviewed.... 880
ohn, Hans. Books of, noticed......... 259
—— Book of, reviewed.............. 543
oontz, Harold. Books of, noticed......1171
OREA. Book notices.................. 580
raenzel, Frederick. Books of, noted.... 885
raus, Wolfgang H. Book notes........ 898
ropotkin, Peter. Books of, noticed..... 270
undra, J. C. Books of, noted.......... 906

ABOR. Book notices..........241, 580, 1182
Book reviews on: Baldwin, George D. *Beyond Nationalization*............1150
Chinoy, Ely. *Automobile Workers and the American Dream*............... 235
Dewar, Margaret. *Labour Policy in the USSR, 1917–1928*.............1147
Spero, Sterling D. *Labor Relations in British Nationalized Industry*.......1150
Laird, Angus McKenzie. Books of, reviewed.........................1164
Lane, Robert E. Book notes........... 599
—— Book reviews.................. 223
Larson, James E. Books of, noticed..... 551
Lasswell, Harold D. The Political Science of Science: An Inquiry into the Possible Reconciliation of Mastery and Freedom........................ 961
Latham, Earl. Book reviews............ 544
LATIN AMERICA. Lott, Leo. Latin American Local Government............1118
Lattimore, Owen. Books of, reviewed.... 851
Laves, Walter H. C. Book reviews...... 220
Lazarsfeld, Paul F. Books of, noticed.... 918
Leach, Richard H. Book notes.......... 549
Leavelle, Arnaud B. Articles and Documents on Political Theory.....919, 1209
Lecht, Leonard A. Books of, noticed.... 552
LEGAL THEORY AND INSTITUTIONS. Book notes.......................268, 549
Book notices...................... 917
Aumann, Francis R. *The Instrumentalities of Justice*..............1162
Khadduri, Majid. *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*.................. 854
—— and Liebesny, Herbert J. (eds.). *Law in the Middle East*. Volume I... 854
Mayers, Lewis. *The American Legal System*......................... 234
Vanderbilt, Arthur T. *Judges and Jurors*..........................1162
LEGISLATIVE PROCESS. Bone, Hugh A. An Introduction to the Senate Policy Committees........................ 339
Truman, David B. The State Delegations and the Structure of Party Voting in the United States House of Representatives..................1023
Book notices........550, 553, 580, 889, 900
Book reviews on: Young, Roland. *Congressional Politics in the Second World War*.......................... 520
Lerner, Max. Book reviews............ 522
Levine, Isaac Don. Books of, noticed....1183
Lewis, Ben W. Book reviews...........1150
Leyendecker, Hilary M. Books of, noted. 238
Li, Tieh-tseng. Books of, reviewed......1161
LIBERIA. Book notices................. 579
Lidderdale, D. W. S. Books of, noticed.. 580
Liebenow, J. Gus, Jr. Responses to Planned Political Change in a Tan-

ganyika Tribal Group 442
Liebesny, Herbert J. Books of, reviewed. 854
Lindsay, Michael. Books of, reviewed... 514
Lippmann, Walter. Books of, reviewed.. 212
Lipsky, George A. Book notes.......... 247
Lipson, Leslie. Book reviews........... 227
Liu Wu-Chi. Books of, noticed......... 918
Livingston, William S. Book notes...... 897
Book reviews.......................1166
Lockard, W. Duane. Book reviews......1164
Lott, Leo B. Executive Power in Venezuela.......................... 422
—— Latin American Local Government.............................1118
Lubell, Samuel. Books of, reviewed.....1144

McClosky, Herbert. Book reviews......1134
McConnell, John W. Books of, noticed.. 552
Macdonald, Austin F. Books of, noticed. 551
MacDonald, H. Malcolm. Book notes... ....1168, 1207
McGovern, William M. Book reviews...1161
McHargue, Daniel S. Books of, reviewed. 534
MacIver, Robert M. Books of, reviewed. 527
McKenzie, R. T. Books of, reviewed.... 227
Macmahon, Arthur W. Woodrow Wilson as Legislative Leader and Administrator.......................... 641
McMillan, Malcolm Cook. Books of, noted.......................... 237
MacNeil, Neil. Books of, noticed.......1171
Macridis, Roy. A Note on the Revision of the Constitution of the Fourth Republic...........................1011
Book reviews...................... 534
McWhinney, Edward. Book reviews.... 232
Macy, Harry; Dauer, Manning J.; Stephenson, William A. F.; and Temple, David. Toward a Model State Presidential Primary Law.... 138
MALAYA. Book reviews on: Emerson, Rupert. *Representative Government in Southeast Asia*................... 505
Mallory, J. R. Books of, reviewed...... 230
Manly, Chesly. Books of, noticed....... 260
Manuel, Frank. Books of, reviewed.....1158
Marcy, Carl M. Books of, reviewed..... 856
Marein, Nathan. Books of, noticed...... 251
Marke, Julius J. Books of, noticed...... 241
Martin, Laurence W. Books of, noticed.1194
Marx, Karl. Books of, noticed.......... 270
Mason, Alpheus Thomas. Books of, reviewed........................... 525
Mason, Henry L. Books of, noted....... 905
Mason, John Brown. Book notes.......1192
MASSACHUSETTS. Book notices........... 889
Book reviews on: Brown, Robert E. *Middle-Class Democracy in the Revolution in Massachusetts, 1691–1780*..11
Matthews, Donald R. Book reviews..... 2
Mayer, Frederick. Books of, noticed.... 27
Mayers, Lewis. Books of, reviewed...... 2
Mayo, H. B. Books of, reviewed........ 1
Meisel, James H. Book reviews.........11
Merson, Martin. Books of, noticed...... 5
METHODOLOGY. Eckstein, Harry (Rapporteur). Political Theory and the Study of Politics: A Report of a Conference......................... 47
Kariel, Henry. The Limits of Social Science: Henry Adams' Quest for Order..........................107
Prothro, James W. Verbal Shifts in the American Presidency: A Content Analysis......................... 72
White, Howard B. Commentary on Prothro's Content Analysis........ 74
Articles and documents..279, 607, 923, 121
Book notices...................... 27
Book reviews on: Bailey, Stephen K., *et al. Research Frontiers in Politics and Government: Brookings Lectures, 1955*......................... 54
Wright, Quincy. *The Study of International Relations*............... 21
Metz, Harold W. Books of, noticed.....117
Metzger, Walter P. Books of, reviewed.. 52
Meyer, Alfred G. Book reviews.........114
—— Books of, reviewed............. 19
Meynaud, Jean. Books of, noticed...... 26
Meyriat, Jean. Books of, noticed....... 26
MIDDLE EAST. Alderfer, Harold F. Near East Local Government...........112
Book notices...................... 59
Book reviews on: Khadduri, Majid. *War and Peace in the Law of Islam*.. 85
—— and Liebesny, Herbert J. (eds.). *Law in the Middle East. Volume I*... 85
MILITARY AFFAIRS. Book reviews on: Ekirch, Arthur A., Jr. *The Civilian and the Military*.................115
Kaufmann, William W. (ed.). *Military Policy and National Security*... 87
Book notices...................... 89
Miller, Warren E. One-Party Politics and the Voter........................ 70
Mills, C. Wright. Books of, noted.......116
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores (Nicaragua). Books of, noticed.......... 25
Ministerium des Innern of the Saar. Books of, noticed....................... 57
MISSISSIPPI. Book reviews on: Highsaw, Robert B. and Fortenberry, Charles N. *The Government and Administra-*

- tion of *Mississippi* 1164
- NGOLIA. Book reviews on: Lattimore, Owen. *Nationalism and Revolution in Mongolia* 851
- oore, Edmund A. Books of, noticed 1170
- oore, Frank J. Books of, noticed 578
- oos, Malcolm. Books of, reviewed 544
- orlan, Robert L. Books of, noted 237
- oses, Robert. Books of, noted 1169
- UNICIPAL GOVERNMENT. Zink, Harold. Selected Materials for a Comparative Study of Local Government 1107
  - Book notes 886, 1169
  - Book notices 240, 241, 260, 551, 918
- usolf, Lloyd D. Canadian Public Enterprise: A Character Study 405

- adworny, Milton J. Books of, noticed 552
- TURAL RESOURCES. Book notes 885, 886
  - Book notices 888
- eumann, Sigmund. Book reviews 532
  - —— Books of, noted 1180
- W YORK. Book reviews on: Caldwell, Lynton K. *The Government and Administration of New York* 1164
- ews and Notes 284, 613, 927, 1219
- ibley, Hugh. Book notes 887
- CARAGUA. Book notices 251
- iebuhr, Reinhold. Books of, noted 1206
- igro, Felix. Book notes 577
  - —— Book reviews 858
- RTH CAROLINA. Book reviews on: Rankin, Robert S. *The Government and Administration of North Carolina* 1164
- ye, Russel B. Books of, noticed 242

- ckert, Roy A. Books of, noticed 580
- degard, Peter H. Book reviews 527
- gata, Shijuro. Books of, noticed 578
- 'Keane, Josephine. Books of, noticed 242
- verstreet, Gene D. Book notes 906

- adelford, Norman J., Penniman, Howard R., *et al.* Revision of the Nomination and Election Procedure of the Association: A Symposium 488
- KISTAN. Book notes 907
  - Book notices 1184
- atterson, Bennett B. Books of, noted 549
- earn, B. R. Books of, noticed 258
- eel, Roy V. Book reviews 1149
- enniman, Clara. Books of, noticed 551
- enniman, Howard R., Padelford, Norman J., *et al.* Revision of the Nomination and Election Procedure of the Association: A Symposium 488
- ennock, J. Roland, Griffith, Ernest S., and Plamenatz, John. Cultural Prerequisites to a Successfully Functioning Democracy: A Symposium 101
- Percy, Lord, of Newcastle. Books of, noticed 269
- PHILIPPINES. Thomas, M. Ladd. Philippine Local Government 1124
  - Book notes 576
  - Book reviews on: Emerson, Rupert. *Representative Government in Southeast Asia* 505
- Plamenatz, John. Books of, reviewed 199
  - ——, Pennock, J. Roland, and Griffith, Ernest S. Cultural Prerequisites to a Successfully Functioning Democracy: A Symposium 101
- Plano, Jack C. Book notes 907
- Plischke, Elmer. Books of, noticed 589
- POLITICAL BEHAVIOR. Eldersveld, Samuel J. Experimental Propaganda Techniques and Voting Behavior 154
  - Harrison, Selig S. Caste and the Andhra Communists 378
  - Liebenow, J. Gus, Jr. Responses to Planned Political Change in a Tanganyika Tribal Group 442
  - Miller, Warren E. One-Party Politics and the Voter 707
  - Book notes 898, 1181
  - Book notices 889
  - Book reviews on: Lubell, Samuel. *Revolt of the Moderates* 1144
    - Scammon, Richard M. *America Votes—A Handbook of Contemporary American Election Statistics* 1141
    - Stouffer, Samuel A. *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties* 223
    - Thomson, Charles A. H. *Television and Presidential Politics* 882
- POLITICAL LEADERSHIP. Macmahon, Arthur W. Woodrow Wilson as Legislative Leader and Administrator 641
  - Book notes 897
  - Book reviews on: Bracher, Karl Dietrich. *Die Auflösung der Weimarer Republik* 533
- POLITICAL PARTIES. Dauer, Manning J., *et al.* Toward a Model State Presidential Primary Law 138
  - Epstein, Leon D. Cohesion of British Parliamentary Parties 360
  - Miller, Warren E. One-Party Politics and the Voter 707
  - Sorauf, Frank J. State Patronage in a Rural County 1046
  - Truman, David B. The State Delegations and the Structure of Party

Voting in the United States House of Representatives....................1023
The Democratic Party's Approach to Its Convention Rules............. 553
Book notes................237, 576, 1180
Book notices..........241, 242, 1170, 1171
Book reviews on: Acheson, Dean. *A Democrat Looks at His Party*....... 867
Key, V. O., Jr. *American State Politics*..............................1143
Williams, John R. *The Conservative Party of Canada, 1920–1949*........1146
POLITICAL SCIENCE. Lasswell, Harold D. The Political Science of Science: An Inquiry into the Possible Reconciliation of Mastery and Freedom...... 961
Seyler, William C. Doctoral Dissertations in Political Science........... 807
Book notices.......................... 270
Book reviews on: Bailey, Stephen K., *et al. Research Frontiers in Politics and Government: Brookings Lectures, 1955* 544
POLITICAL THEORY. Eckstein, Harry (Rapporteur). Political Theory and the Study of Politics: A Report of a Conference.......................... 475
Ewart, Lewis. The Contribution of Medieval Thought to the American Political Tradition................ 462
Griffith, Ernest S., Plamenatz, John, and Pennock, J. Roland. Cultural Prerequisites to a Successfully Functioning Democracy: A Symposium.. 101
White, Howard B. Commentary on Prothro's Content Analysis........ 740
Wolin, Sheldon S. Politics and Religion: Luther's Simplistic Imperative.......................... 24
Articles and documents..271, 601, 919, 1209
Book notes......598, 599, 1204, 1205, 1206
Book notices
.......241, 269, 270, 271, 917, 1207, 1208
Book reviews on: D'Addio, Mario. *L'Idea del Contratto Sociale dai Sofisti alla Riforma*.......................... 869
Dahl, Robert A. *A Preface to Democratic Theory*.......................1134
Deane, Herbert A. *The Political Ideas of Harold J. Laski*................. 522
Heimann, Eduard. *Vernunftglaube und Religion in der Modernen Gesellschaft*.......................... 532
Hunt, R. N. Carew. *Marxism: Past and Present*...................... 199
Lippmann, Walter. *Essays in the Public Philosophy*.................... 212
Manuel, Frank. *The New World of Henri Saint-Simon*................11
Mayo, H. B. *Democracy and Marxism* 1
Meyer, Alfred G. *Marxism: The Unity of Theory and Practice*....... 1
Plamenatz, John. *German Marxism and Russian Communism*.......... 1
Rowe, Constance. *Voltaire and the State*.......................... 8
Von Fritz, Kurt. *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity*..... 5
Pollock, James K. Books of, reviewed... 5
Poole, Kenyon E. Books of, noticed.....11
Popper, Monica. Books of, noticed...... 9
Prasad, Rajendra. Book of, noticed.....12
PRESS. Book notes. Book notices......888, 8
Price, Harry Bayard, Jr. Books of, reviewed.......................... 5
Price, M. Philips. Books of, noticed.....11
PROPAGANDA. Book notices............. 2
Prothro, James W. Verbal Shifts in the American Presidency: A Content Analysis.......................... 7
PSYCHOLOGY. Book notes............... 5
Book notices...........241, 916, 918, 12
Book reviews on: Allport, Gordon W. *Becoming*.......................... 5
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION. Dimock, Marshall E. The Administrative Staff College: Executive Development in Government and Industry........ 1
Kaufman, Herbert. Emerging Conflicts in the Doctrines of Public Administration..........................105
Macmahon, Arthur W. Woodrow Wilson as Legislative Leader and Administrator.................... 64
Book notes..........................116
Book notices......551, 553, 888, 1171, 118
Book reviews on: Colm, Gerhard. *The Federal Budget and the National Economy*.......................... 84
Gladden, E. N. *The Essentials of Public Administration*................ 87
Kelsall, R. K. *Higher Civil Servants in Britain*.......................... 22
Smithies, Arthur. *The Budgetary Process in the United States*......... 84
Tickton, Sidney G. *The Budget in Transition*.......................... 84
The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations: A Report to the President for Transmittal to the Congress...... 20
The Need for Further Budget Reform: A Joint NPA Statement...... 84
PUBLIC FINANCE. Book notes........... 88
Book notices..........................117
Book reviews on: Colm, Gerhard. *The*

Federal Budget and the National Economy 847
Smithies, Arthur. *The Budgetary Process in the United States* 847
Tickton, Sidney G. *The Budget in Transition* 847
The Need for Further Budget Reform: A Joint NPA Statement 847
BLIC OPINION. Eldersveld, Samuel J. Experimental Propaganda Techniques and Voting Behavior 154
Book notes 599
Book notices 916
BLIC REGULATION. Book notes 239
Book notices 240, 552, 888, 889, 1171
llen, William R. Books of, noticed 240
sey, Merlo J. Books of, noticed 1170
ziur, Eugene. Books of, noticed 917

igley, Harold S. Book reviews....225, 1159
—— Books of, reviewed 876

ckman, Emanuel. Books of, reviewed . 536
nkin, Robert S. Books of, reviewed...1164
nney, Austin. Books of, noticed 1170
dfield, Robert. Books of, noted 268
es, Richard. Books of, noticed 249
id, J. H. Stewart. Books of, noted 576
ischauer, Edwin O. Books of, reviewed 225
iss, H. S. Books of, noticed 917
LIGION. Book notes 1204, 1206
Book notices 1170
SEARCH. Book reviews on: Bailey, Stephen K., *et al. Research Frontiers in Politics and Government: Brookings Lectures, 1955* 544
Articles and documents ..279, 607, 923, 1215
shetar, John S., Jr. Book reviews 539
x, Millicent Barton. Books of, noticed. 579
ch, Bennett M. and Burch, Philip H., Jr. The Changing Role of the National Guard 702
ethmayer, Leo C. Book notes 576
bbins, Lionel. Books of, reviewed 860
berts, B. C. Books of, noticed 1182
berts, Elliott. Books of, noted 885
berts, William H. Articles and Documents on Foreign and Comparative Government 251, 580
—— Articles and Documents on International Law and Relations........ ....260, 590, 909, 1195
binson, Kenneth. A Survey of the Background Material for the Study of Government in French Tropical Africa 179
che, John P. Book notes 1203

—— Book reviews 862
Rodell, Fred. Books of, noticed 550
Rosenblum, Victor G. Books of, noticed . 917
Ross, J. F. S. Books of, reviewed 1166
Rossi, Ernesto. Books of, reviewed 519
Rossiter, Clinton. Books of, reviewed.... ....864, 881
Rostow, W. W. Books of, reviewed 225
Rowe, Constance. Books of, reviewed ... 870
Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life (Saskatchewan). Books of, noticed 579
Royama, Michio. Books of, noticed 578
Royama, Shimako. Books of, noticed 578
RUMANIA. Book notices 1184
RUSSIA. Kenney, Charles D. The Twentieth C.P.S.U. Congress: A Study in Calculated Moderation 764
Book notes 247
Book notices......249, 250, 589, 1183, 1194
Book reviews on: Brzezinski, Zbigniew K. *The Permanent Purge*........... 872
Dallin, David J. *The Changing World of Soviet Russia*..................1147
Dewar, Margaret. *Labour Policy in the USSR, 1917–1928*.............1147
Simmons, Ernest J. (ed.). *Continuity and Change in Russian and Soviet Thought* 539
Rustow, Dankwart A. Book reviews..... 854
—— Books of, reviewed 1149

SAAR. Book notices 579, 589
Samra, Chattar Singh. Book notes 1208
Sartre, Jean Paul. Books of, noticed 1207
Savord, Ruth. Books of, noticed 589
Sayre, Wallace S. Book reviews 229
Scaff, Alvin H. Books of, noted 576
Scammon, Richard M. Books of, reviewed 1141
Schiffman, Joseph. Books of, noticed 917
Schiller, A. Arthur. Books of, reviewed .. 505
Schrieke, B. Books of, noticed 248
Schwartz, Bernard. Books of, noticed ... 240
Scott, F. R. Book reviews 230
Seckler-Hudson, Catheryn. Books of, noticed 551
Seyler, William C. Doctoral Dissertations in Political Science................. 807
Shannon, David A. Books of, noticed..... 242
Shea, Donald R. Books of, noted 587
Sheehy, Michael. Books of, noticed 1182
Shepherd, William R. Books of, noticed ..1208
Shils, Edward A. Books of, noted 887
Short, Lloyd M. Books of, noticed 551
Shwadran, Benjamin. Books of, noticed .. 590
Sigafoos, Robert A. Books of, noted..... 886

Simmons, Ernest J. Books of, reviewed.. 539
Simon, Herbert A. Articles and Documents on Methodology and Research in the Social Sciences..279, 607, 923, 1215
—— Books of, reviewed............. 544
Simon, Walter M. Books of, noticed.... 249
Simons, Anne P. Books of, reviewed.... 218
Sinclair, William Angus. Books of, noticed............................1208
Small, Joseph. Books of, noticed........1208
Smith, Charles Page. Books of, noted...1203
Smith, David G. Book notes........... 899
Smith, M. Brewster. Books of, noticed... 916
Smith, R. E. Books of, noticed......... 248
Smithies, Arthur. Books of, noted....... 887
—— Books of, reviewed..........847, 860
Snyder, Richard C. Books of, noticed.... 259
—— Book of, reviewed.............. 544
SOCIAL PROBLEMS. Book notes...238, 884, 887
  Book notices................240, 552, 918
SOCIALISM. Musolf, Lloyd D. Canadian Public Enterprise: A Character Study.......................... 405
  Book notices..............270, 1184, 1208
  Book reviews on: Einaudi, Mario, Byé, Maurice, and Rossi, Ernesto. *Nationalization in France and Italy*........ 519
    Heimann, Eduard. *Vernunftglaube und Religion in der Modernen Gesellschaft*......................... 532
SOCIOLOGY. Liebenow, J. Gus, Jr. Responses to Planned Political Change in a Tanganyika Tribal Group..... 442
  Book notes...................268, 1168
  Book notices...248, 271, 890, 909, 918, 1208
  Book reviews on: Chinoy, Ely. *Automoble Workers and the American Dream*......................... 235
Sorauf, Frank J. State Patronage in a Rural County...................1046
SOUTHEAST ASIA. Book reviews on: Emerson, Rupert. *Representative Government in Southeast Asia*............. 505
SPAIN. Book notes.................... 576
Spain, August O. Book notes...........1193
Spencer, Samuel R., Jr. Books of, noticed. 240
Spengler, Joseph J. Books of, reviewed.. 860
Spero, Sterling D. Books of, reviewed...1150
Spiro, Melford E. Books of, noticed..... 918
STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT. Dauer, Manning J. *et al.* Toward a Model, State Presidential Primary Law..... 138
    Sorauf, Frank J. State Patronage in a Rural County..................1046
    Zink, Harold. Selected Materials for a Comparative Study of Local Government.....................1107
  Book notes............237, 884, 886, 11
  Book notices......................
    ....240, 241, 260, 551, 889, 890, 9
  Book reviews on: Caldwell, Lynton K. *The Government and Administration of New York*....................11
    Doyle, Wilson K., Laird, Angus M. and Weiss, S. Sherman. *The Government and Administration of Florida*...11
    Gosnell, Cullen B. and Anderson, C. David. *The Government and Administration of Georgia*................11
    Highsaw, Robert B. and Fortenberry, Charles N. *The Government and Administration of Mississippi*........11
    Key, V. O., Jr. *American State Politics*.........................11
    Rankin, Robert S. *The Government and Administration of North Carolina*.11
    Trachsel, Herman H. and Wade, Ralph M. *The Government and Administration of Wyoming*..........11
  Book reviews on: *The Forty-Eight States*.......................... 8
Statistisches Landesamt (Stuttgart). Books of, noticed...................... 2
Stebbins, Richard P. Books of, noticed... 2
Steefel, Lawrence. Book reviews......... 5
Steiner, Kurt. Japanese Local Government...........................11
Stephenson, William A. F.; Dauer, Manning J.; Macy, Harry; and Temple, David. Toward a Model State Presidential Primary Law............. 1
Stevens, Edmund. Books of, noticed.... 2
Stevenson, Adlai E. Books of, noticed... 5
Stillman, Calvin W. Books of, noticed... 5
Stocking, George W. Books of, noticed.... 2
Stouffer, Samuel A. Books of, reviewed... 2
Stout, Hiram M. Articles and Documents on Foreign and Comparative Government.......................901, 11
Strausz-Hupé, Robert. Books of, noticed. 12
Strong, Donald S. Book reviews........ 8
—— Books of, noticed..............11
Stuart, Graham H. Books of, noticed.... 2
Svarlien, Oscar. Books of, noticed...... 2
Swarthout, John M. Books of, noticed... 2
SWEDEN. Baude, Annika. Swedish Local Government....................11
  Book reviews on: Rustow, Dankwart A. *The Politics of Compromise*.......11
Swift, Richard N. Books of, noticed..... 2
SWITZERLAND. Book notices............ 5
Szunyogh, Bela. Books of, noticed...... 2

Taborsky, Edward. Book reviews....... 8

GANYIKA. Liebenow, J. Gus, Jr. Responses to Planned Political Change in a Tanganyika Tribal Group...... 442
ylor, Philip B., Jr. The Guatemalan Affair: A Critique of United States Foreign Policy.................. 787
CHING. Book notices............... 590
ook reviews on: Wright, Quincy. *The Study of International Relations*...... 216
nple, David; Dauer, Manning J., Stephenson, William A. F.; and Macy, Harry. Toward a Model State Presidential Primary Law.......... 138
ILAND. Book notices................ 578
omas, Lewis Herbert. Books of, noticed..........................1182
omas, M. Ladd. Philippine Local Government.....................1124
ompson, Arthur W. Books of, noticed.. 271
omson, Charles A. H. Books of, reviewed.......................... 882
ET. Book reviews on: Li, Tieh-tseng. *The Historical Status of Tibet*........1161
kton, Sidney G. Books of, reviewed... 847
edemann, Arthur E. Books of, noticed 248
oley, M. J. Books of, noticed........ 917
ynbee, Arnold. Books of, noticed..... 258
ynbee, Veronica M. Books of, noticed.. 258
chsel, Herman H. Books of, reviewed.1164
solini, R. J. Book notes.............1169
man, David B. The State Delegations and the Structure of Party Voting in the United States House of Representatives.........................1023
—— Books of, reviewed............. 544
fts, Robert W. Book reviews......... 509
gwell, Rexford G. Books of, noticed... 552
KEY. Book notices.................1184
rner, John E. Books of, reviewed..... 876

m, Adam B. Book notes............. 576
mann, Walter. Books of, noted......1204
derhill, Frank H. Books of, noticed....1182
ESCO. Books of, noticed........269, 909
ited Nations. Book notes....587, 907, 1192
ook notices............259, 260, 588, 908
ook reviews on: Claude, Inis L., Jr. *National Minorities*............... 222
Goodrich, Leland M. and Simons, Anne P. *The United Nations and the Maintenance of International Peace and Security*..................... 218
Wilcox, Francis O. and Marcy, Carl M. *Proposals for Changes in the United Nations*.................. 856
United Nations Secretariat. Books of, noticed............................ 588
UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY. Taylor, Philip B., Jr. The Guatemalan Affair: A Critique of United States Foreign Policy......................... 787
Book notices.....................
....240, 259, 260, 553, 589, 590, 908, 1194
Book reviews on: Beloff, Max. *Foreign Policy and the Democratic Process*... 538
Buehrig, Edward H. *Woodrow Wilson and the Balance of Power*........... 547
Price, Harry Bayard, Jr. *The Marshall Plan and Its Meaning*......... 509
Reischauer, Edwin O. *Wanted: An Asian Policy*..................... 225
Study Group Sponsored by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation and the National Planning Association. *The Political Economy of American Foreign Policy*...................... 220
Westerfield, H. Bradford. *Foreign Policy and Party Politics*........... 512
Young, Roland. *Congressional Politics in the Second World War*....... 520
UNITED STATES MILITARY GOVERNMENT Ward, Robert E. The Origins of the Present Japanese Constitution..... 980
UNITED STATES NATIONAL GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS. Bone, Hugh A. An Introduction to the Senate Policy Committees......................... 339
Huntington, Samuel P. Civilian Control and the Constitution.......... 676
Macmahon, Arthur W. Woodrow Wilson As Legislative Leader and Administrator.................... 641
Rich, Bennett M. and Burch, Philip H., Jr. The Changing Role of the National Guard................. 702
Truman, David B. The State Delegations and the Structure of Party Voting in the United States House of Representatives..................1023
Articles and documents..242, 569, 890, 1172
Book notes....................887, 1169
Book notices.......240, 242, 889, 890, 1170
Book reviews on: Corwin, Edward S. and Koenig, Louis W. *The Presidency Today*......................... 880
Price, Harry Bayard, Jr. *The Marshall Plan and Its Meaning*......... 509
Rossiter, Clinton. *The American Presidency*...................... 881
Young, Roland. *Congressional Politics in the Second World War*........ 520
Commission on Intergovernmental Re-

lations: A Report to the President for Transmittal to the Congress 208
Urrutia, Lcdo. Mico. Books of, noticed ... 251
Uyehara, Cecil H. Books of, noticed 578

Vanderbilt, Arthur T. Books of, noted 549
Van Leur, J. C. Books of, noticed 248
Varma, Vishwanath Prasad. Books of, noted 1205
VATICAN. Book notices 908
Vaughan, Floyd L. Books of, noticed 552
Vella, Walter F. Books of, noticed 578
VENEZUELA. Lott, Leo B. Executive Power in Venezuela 422
Vigman, Fred K. Books of, noticed 240
Vinacke, Harold M. Books of, reviewed ..1159
Viner, Jacob. Books of, reviewed 860
VIRGINIA. Book notices 889
Von Fritz, Kurt. Books of, reviewed 515
Von Grunebaum, Gustave E. Books of, noticed 578

Wade, Ralph M. Books of reviewed 1164
Waldo, Dwight. Book reviews 847
Wallace, Raymond J. Books of, noticed .. 580
Waltz, Kenneth. Book reviews 222
Ward, Robert E. The Origins of the Present Japanese Constitution 980
Wasson, Donald. Books of, noticed 589
Watkins, Frederick M. Book reviews 212
Watkins, James T., IV. Book reviews 514
Weeks, O. Douglas. Book reviews 864
Weidner, Edward W. Book notes 886
Weiss, S. Sherman. Books of, reviewed ..1164
Wells, Roger H. German State and Local Government 1112
Wengert, Norman. Book notes 237, 885
Westerfield, H. Bradford. Book reviews .. 547
—— Books of, reviewed 5
Wheare, K. C. Book reviews 2
Whitaker, Arthur P. Books of, noted 11
White, Howard B. Commentary on Prothro's Content Analysis 7
White, Robert W. Books of, noticed 9
Whiting, Allen S. Books of, noticed 5
Wilcox, Francis O. Books of, reviewed ... 8
Willbern, York. Book notes 8
Williams, Irving G. Books of, noted 11
Williams, John R. Books of, reviewed ...11
Wilson, Francis G. Articles and Documents on Political Theory 271, 6
Winston, Clara. Books of, noted 11
Winston, Richard. Books of, noted 11
Wolfers, Arnold. Books of, noticed 11
Wolff, Robert Lee. Books of, noticed 11
Wolin, Sheldon S. Politics and Religion: Luther's Simplistic Imperative .....
—— Book reviews 8
Woodman, Dorothy. Books of, noticed .. 5
Woodward, E. L. Books of, noticed ...588, 5
Woytinsky, E. S. Books of, noticed 5
Woytinsky, W. S. Books of, noticed 5
Wright, Quincy. Books of, reviewed 2
WYOMING. Book reviews on: Trachsel, Herman H. and Wade, Ralph M. *The Government and Administration of Wyoming* 11

Young, Roland. Books of, reviewed 5
Young, William H. Book reviews 8
YUGOSLAVIA. Book notices 11

Zaleski, Eugène. Books of, noticed 11
Zink, Harold. Selected Materials for a Comparative Study of Local Government 11

OFFICERS OF THE AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION

President

E. E. Schattschneider
Wesleyan University

President Elect

V. O. Key
Harvard University

Vice Presidents

Carl Brent Swisher
Johns Hopkins University

Wilfred Binkley
Ohio Northern University

Albert Lepawsky
University of California
(Berkeley)

Secretary

Gladys Kammerer
University of Kentucky

Treasurer

Max M. Kampelman
Washington, D. C.

Executive Director

Evron M. Kirkpatrick
1726 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington 6, D. C.

Managing Editor
The American Political Science Review

Harvey C. Mansfield
The Ohio State University

Associate Director
Kenneth Hechler

COUNCIL

Above-named Officers *ex officiis*

Weldon Cooper
  University of Virginia
Paul T. David
  The Brookings Institution
Herbert Emmerich
  Public Administration Clearing House
Claude E. Hawley
  United States Information Agency
Norman L. Hill
  University of Nebraska
Thomas P. Jenkin
  University of California (Los Angeles)
Louise Overacker
  Wellesley College
Charles B. Robson
  University of North Carolina
William T. R. Fox
  Columbia University
Ruth Weintraub
  Hunter College
John D. Lewis
  Oberlin College
Thomas H. Eliot
  Washington University, St. Louis
Alexander Heard
  University of North Carolina
York Willbern
  University of Alabama
Allan Saunders
  University of Hawaii
Christian Larsen
  Sacramento State College

FORMER PRESIDENTS

Frank J. Goodnow
Albert Shaw
Frederic N. Judson
James Bryce
A. Lawrence Lowell
Woodrow Wilson
Simeon E. Baldwin
Albert Bushnell Hart
W. W. Willoughby
John Bassett Moore
Ernst Freund
Jesse Macy
Munroe Smith
Henry Jones Ford
Paul S. Reinsch
Leo S. Rowe
William A. Dunning
Harry A. Garfield
James W. Garner
Charles E. Merriam
Charles A. Beard
William B. Munro
Jesse S. Reeves
John A. Fairlie
Benjamin F. Shambaugh
Edward S. Corwin
William F. Willoughby
Isidor Loeb
Walter J. Shepard
Francis W. Coker
Arthur N. Holcombe
Thomas Reed Powell
Clarence A. Dykstra
Charles Grove Haines
Robert C. Brooks
Frederic A. Ogg
William Anderson
Robert E. Cushman
Leonard D. White
John M. Gaus
Walter F. Dodd
Arthur W. Macmahon
Henry R. Spencer
Quincy Wright
James K. Pollock
Peter H. Odegard
Luther H. Gulick
Pendleton Herring
Ralph J. Bunche
Charles McKinley
Harold D. Lasswell

21570